The Adventures in the *Odyssey*

KARL REINHARDT
(translated by Harriet I. Flower)

Origins

When stories about wonders become clever, and when cultures begin to be reflected in fairy tales, possibilities develop for a particular kind of interplay with, as it were, an exchange of roles between, older and newer stories. In this process the more recent elements do not replace the older ones but rather absorb them into their own world. There they function as a balance and contrast and as an element of transcendence, which is an essential part of any art form. I suppose it is possible to see such an interplay with fairy tales and novellas in nearly all collections of stories from times of rich cultural growth, but especially in those cases where the storytellers feel that irony is an essential element in their tales.

Let us consider as an example the story of Aladdin and his magic lamp, a story taken from and contemporary with the *1,001 Nights*. How crude the miracles in this story are. How crude is the way in which the terrifying, omnipotent spirits are conjured up, slaves of anyone who owns the lamp and the ring. How primitive and almost clumsy is the magic that grants a series of ever more impossible wishes, until the owner of the lamp himself succumbs to its enchantment. How full this story is of primitive belief in magic, the presence of spirits and joy in fantasy and the unreal. If it were simply a question of these elements in the story, one would have to think of this story as having originated in very ancient layers of composition.

Yet how different and unconnected to this is the story about the life of the tailor's son. Born in humble circumstances, he starts out as a naive boy, a foolish lout, but he is matured by his circumstances and by the world that he enters, and his behavior becomes increasingly refined. How different in spirit is the contrast between him as the true lover and his aristocratic rival, the Vizier's son, whose ardor is already dampened at the second night spent in shame. How different in spirit is the poor, unassuming mother, hopelessly waiting outside the door and scheming on behalf of her good-for-nothing son, who is in love. How different in spirit are the descriptions of the splendor, the jewels, the costumes, the banquets and palaces, not to

This article is an expanded form of the original Leipzig inaugural lecture given in 1942.

mention the speeches, ceremonies, customs and manners. How much more cultured is this picture of the Orient, probably reflecting nothing earlier than the seventeenth century. And yet this dichotomy does not tear the whole story apart, but rather, for the first time, makes it a real unity, because these revelations of the supernatural world bring to light the true character of the world of the humans, and the contradictions and limitations of their society.

The story tells of how a ruler allows himself to be impressed by wealth that is beyond his dreams. "'My son," replied the sultan, as he embraced him again, "you would be quite wrong if you wanted to doubt, even for a moment, the sincerity of the promise which I have given you."' How ironic this is after all that has happened before. And how love for a princess transforms a ne'er-do-well into a young man of the noblest principles overnight. The genie is now summoned for very different purposes than for sweets! How the psychological elements are clothed in marvels! This is the story of the rise of a lucky man, in which the outer miracle that happens to him causes an inner miracle to take place inside him. So the lamp conjures up for its owner all the accomplishments suited to the rank that he receives through it. What dual significance the magic takes on! As soon as one tries to grasp the psychological elements, they blend into the fairy-tale elements. And yet something is sketched here by means of a fairy tale, which could just as well be told in the plot of a novel by Balzac.

But, you will ask, what has this to do with the *Odyssey*? The material has no connection at all. Yet as an example of the possibilities that exist, when fairy tales become wise, and when the wonders of fairy tales are combined with patterns of human behavior, the story of the magic lamp can show us the goal we are aiming at with the *Odyssey*. How is the contrast *here* between the world of the wonderful adventures and the world of the heroes of the *Iliad*, that contrast between the stuff of fairy tales and great epic with its very different conventions, mastered, bridged, and made into a poem?

With this question we are advancing, if not into the holy of holies, at least into the inner sanctum of the *Odyssey*. It is no accident that we would hardly pose ourselves this question in the case of the *Iliad*. For in the *Iliad* the raw material is already heroic. In the *Odyssey* we cannot even assume that these adventures were already in a heroic, "Homeric" form before they entered the epic through this poet. But for the philologist there is an additional consideration: in dealing with this question he can breathe freely again.

Philological criticism had almost become a kind of game of dominoes. Whole epics and eventually the whole *Odyssey* were composed of complete epics, like lots of little building blocks, which could be identified by their joins. People played this game against each other and were happy when it worked out evenly, without leaving any remainders. The game went on until it was discovered that the joins, by which the blocks were being differentiated, were not breaks or gaps but overlapping joints, carefully shaped to

fit each other. That is to say, these are signs of very intimate connections. Now what? One might have thought that if we have finished playing with little building blocks, then the *Odyssey* is simply the *Odyssey*. In the future the philologist may still have plenty to explain to me about it, but from now on let him leave me in peace with his theories about origins! Not so the heart of the philologist that thinks, "Isn't the way really open now for theories about origins?" Everything that is a creation and has its own existence and effects, has its own origins. The question in each case is what constitutes its origin. It is necessary to develop an idea and type of origin that is suitable for each creation.

To make use of another example, in the case of Goethe's *Faust*, even if all the old versions of Faust were lost to us, as well as Goethe's rough drafts, we would still be differentiating the various "origins" of this poem. For example, the scene "In Auerbach's Cellar" has its origin in folk jesting, in the spirit and character of the old versions of Faust, while a scene like "In the Woods and Caves" has its origins in the "Storm and Stress" movement. The spirit of Shakespeare shines through the Frau Marthe scenes. The same influences would soon also be recognized in the composition of the whole. This can be the case without introducing foreign, contrary elements into the poetry. Rather, the unity of the poem can only be understood in its diversity. Its form can only be described by its content. Likewise, in the case of the *Odyssey*, the question about its origins can really be posed after the bankruptcy of all kinds of hypotheses about origins. Origins would surely no longer be presumed to consist of the manufacture of whole epics consisting of other whole epics, immediately before which there lay, like a chaos, an endless sea of "motifs" allowing for comparisons. Rather, instead of this an origin would be seen as something that should be gleaned from the poetry itself. The origins of the *Odyssey* would therefore not necessarily have to be the same as the origins of *Faust*. Nevertheless, here also we will soon have three elements to distinguish: the element of folklore and fairy tale, the element of contemporary spirit belonging to the beginning of a new age, and an illustrious model, the *Iliad*.

The poet of the *Odyssey* found his great teacher in the poet of the *Iliad*. From him he learned to cross over the threshold before which the older epics about the *Thebaid* and the Argonauts, as well as the later ones of the Epic Cycle, stood still. That is to say, he learned to manage actions taking place in different locations at the same time, to tie together his threads from different directions, and to tell his story in a meandering and torturous way, instead of in a linear order. In other words, to express it in a literary-historical way, he learned to create a story with many strands rather than only one. From the *Iliad* poet he learned to interweave the path of his hero meaningfully with the lives of a certain number of others, to retell the endings of certain previous stories, to delay his story from moving to its conclusion, and to interrupt the main flow of the epic with all kinds of digressions. In this way he transformed the story of a returning husband into a poem about

a father, mother, and son; about masters and servants; about the old and the young; and about the fates of a great number of additional characters also. This poet learned to include didactic material side by side with warnings. He came not only to describe personal relationships but to place these in their social context. At the same time, he sees himself as the educator of his whole people, much more so than the poet of the *Iliad*, who is still paying homage to the courts of princes. In brief, in his poem about a return home or *nostos*, his poetry embraces everything that represents his world. This world is in many respects more contemporary than that of the *Iliad*, but it does include both the heroism of the *Iliad* and very ancient fairy-tale elements. Only a plan to portray a complete world picture enabled these two themes of revenge on the one hand and adventure on the other, which were quite separate in the raw material of the *Odyssey*, if not to become one, at least to blend into each other. The adventures, transformed into epic situations by the hero's narration of them, could become an episode in Odysseus' return.

The problem of the *Odyssey*, that is to say the question of the coherence and unity of its diverse elements, will be addressed in terms of its oldest component, the adventures. This is an investigation into the possibility of an inquiry about its origins, not in the traditional sense, but in the new way that we are trying to develop.[1]

Old and New Adventures

When faced with the many different adventures that the *Odyssey* brings together, we must first distinguish between the old, fairy-tale adventures and the newly composed ones added later, which belong to a more recent and already historical world. The second group notably includes the lies Odysseus tells about himself in Ithaka. The more deceptive these inventions are, the more circumstantially and historically credible, the more "realistic" they seem to us. In the *Iliad* such differences hardly exist, but rather the action takes place in a much more unified way in the great age of legend, when "heroes" still lived on the earth. How different is the kind of age pictured, for example, in the fourteenth book of the Odyssey (199ff.). It tells of attacks on foreign coasts, the capture of slaves, privateering, greed for gain and deception, piracy, and the mercenary spirit of the Phoenicians who dominate the seas. And against what is almost too historical a background,

[1] For this is not an inquiry into the history of motifs, but is confined to the work itself. All such questions, e.g., whether the Phaiakes might once have been people who ferried the dead, are left out of consideration. The history of motifs is used only for clarification and characterization. The opposite point of view can be found in the comprehensive treatment of Ludwig Radermacher in *Die Erzählungen der Odyssee* (*Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 178 [1915]). Important points are also made by Karl Meuli, *Odyssee und Argonautika* (Berlin, 1921).

contrasting with it, we have the life story, the rise and fall of a man driven by a daemon, who is ready to sell himself again, body and soul, to this creature as soon as he has escaped from it. We see shipwrecks, escape from slavery, etc., and as an end to all this, the pathetic figure of the homeless beggar, who has grown old and points to himself as a warning example. The hero of this story is not a hero, whether in the old sense or in any kind of new one. By birth he is a royal bastard and an audacious fellow (Eumaios is the opposite, a bondsman, but born a king). The luckier he is, the more restless he becomes. And as far as his heroism is concerned, he shows it in very dubious circumstances, dubious not only by comparison with the *Iliad*, because he appeals for mercy to the generosity of the Egyptian king after the failure of the raid.

Do these two series of adventures have anything at all in common? This question was posed, and their styles were seen to be so different that they were adduced as evidence for two separate poets.[2] And yet the new adventure, which seems so realistic to us, grows out of the fairy-tale adventures, taking them as its origin, just as a picture is created through metamorphosis from another one.

Naturally this second series of adventures is not realistic in the nineteenth-century sense of the word. Ancient epic is not realistic in its aims, either in contrast to a romantic episode, or as a spontaneous development of style. It is foreign to epic to portray a slice of "life" simply because it is life. Although these two series seem at first to be very different, there is no lack of common elements between them.

Even the verses are sometimes the same. In both places we find the same description of the journey (14.256 = 11.10, etc.). The storm at sea from the fairy-tale adventure repeats itself in its entirety, apart from a few changes, in the adventure in the real world (14.301f. = 12.403f; 14.259f. is taken with small changes from the adventure with the Cyclops 9. 193f.; 9.43 partly contaminated by 14.259). The difference is that the storm is only a storm now, while in the fairy-tale adventure it was a punishment for sin and a link in the chain of events that led from Skylla to Charybdis. In this way certain realistic, poetical devices, which were already present in the fairy-tale adventure, emerge and combine into a new unity that is no longer fantastic. The "dear" or "godlike" companions become nearly as disobedient to their leader, forgetting his warnings, as the companions of Odysseus in the fairy-tale adventure, when they slaughter the cattle of the sun; but in this case, the warning comes only as a result of human foresight. The course of this new adventure has a certain fairy-tale element: that is, the better the start of the story, the more unpleasant is the surprise later. In this case,

[2] U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1927), p. 18: "Vivid pictures from the violent and changeable lives of the sons of Greek lords and of pirates. . . . Anyone who reflects upon the character of 13 and 14 will tell himself that 13 and 14 are not by the same poet."

however, it is not masses of onrushing giants, as in the adventure of the Laistrygones, but experienced troops and Egyptians who attack to destroy the fleet and crew.

But, above all, the fairy-tale hero and the real adventurer have this in common, that they both see the meaning of their changeable fates in terms of the rule of Zeus. As in the fairy-tale adventure, a causal chain of events gradually takes shape, which points more and more to Zeus rather than to Poseidon. Similarly, the beginnings of a type of autobiographical self-analysis are closely tied to a belief in Zeus, as in the lyric genre that was soon to emerge. Personal elements do not emerge separately from religious ones. But how ironic is the appeal to the king of heaven in the mouth of the adventurer in the *Odyssey*, when compared with the fairy-tale hero:

> But how I wish I had died and met my destiny
> there in Egypt, for there was still more sorrow awaiting me.
> At once I put the well-wrought helm from my head, the great shield
> off my shoulders, and from my hand I let the spear drop,
> and went out into the way of the king and up to his chariot,
> and kissed his knees and clasped them; he rescued me and took pity.

Or

> But Zeus himself, though I had pain in my heart, then put
> into my hands the giant mast of the ship.

Or

> and Zeus who delights in thunder flung down
> a foul panic among my companions

(14.274–79, 310–11, 268–69)

In the flux of life, Zeus is the constant, here as in later time in Solon's great elegy of self-examination "To Himself," which naturally treats this theme in a much more profound way. But how different the same reference to the rule of Zeus already sounds in the *Odyssey*, where the same verses are addressed to Antinoos before the Suitors (17.437f.) and the allusion becomes a test of the humanity of the ambitious young noblemen. The tone here is as serious and ominous as it was ironical before. The difference in tone, of which the same verses are capable, is almost greater in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.

Poetical traits, which were already realistic in the fairy-tale adventures, have become purely human stories in the "real" adventures. Conversely, one of the newer adventures has also intruded among the traditional tales of the world of fairy tale, namely the fight with the Thracian Kikonians (9.39ff.). The story is like the invented adventure in Egypt: attack, division of spoils, disobedience of the companions, who refuse to be persuaded to flee (9.43 ~ 14.259), then on the next day a pitched battle in which the Achaians are defeated. But this, the very first adventure that Odysseus tells to Alkinoos, rightfully stands on the boundary between the real and the fairy-tale worlds

of the epic. Only after the Kikonians do they travel to the Lotus Eaters, into the world of distant wonders. At the same time, the wine with which Odysseus will deceive the Cyclops becomes the guest-present of the priest whom Odysseus spared in the land of the Kikonians. The interweaving of the Kikonian adventure with the story of Polyphemos has a moral. But simultaneously the Kikonian adventure functions as a dire prelude, a warning of what is to come because of the disobedience of the companions. And so the realistic story, which frees itself from the fantastic, in turn mirrors itself in the fairy-tale world. Adventures in the real and fairy-tale world do not mean different poets, but variations in one and the same spirit.

The Number of Ships

In the case of the fairy-tale wanderings, there exists an external but sure way to differentiate between what is newly composed and the old traditions, that is to say, observing the *number* of ships. According to the original tradition, Odysseus sailed with only one ship, like the Argonauts, not with a whole fleet as he does now in our *Odyssey*. Only the transformation of the old sailors' yarns into the style of the *Iliad*, resulted in Odysseus' travels to this completely different world of distant wonders as a hero of the *Iliad* and leader of an army. But for this he needed a fleet. He sets out, as we learn incidentally (9, 159), with twelve ships, the same small contingent as he is given in the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad*. Accordingly, the number of "companions" is increased to five hundred. This occasioned, at the same time, an advantage, namely that the excessively regular series of adventures is divided into two halves, each with a different outcome, one with the fleet and one without. The results were variation, interruptions, and additional disasters. At the same time, of course, the disadvantage was that the poet had to accept a certain number of contradictions between his poetry and the logic of the original stories.[3]

Let us examine the story of the Sirens. We can only imagine that when Odysseus plugs the ears of his comrades with wax and orders them to tie him to the mast, he is the commander of one ship. Otherwise what would happen to the rest of them? The same thing is true in the episode of Skylla and Charybdis. Being able to steer a course between the two of them is enough of a marvel for one ship. What would happen to this story if Odysseus were to steer through the grasping arms of the monster with twelve ships at once? Therefore both adventures do not happen until the second

[3]These contradictions are noted by D. Mülder (*Philologus* 65, 1906), p. 241; Eduard Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (Munich, 1924), p. 41. P. Von der Mühll, "*Odyssee*," in Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. 7 (1940), c. 721 (in P. von der Mühll, *Ausgewählte Klein Schriften*, ed. B. Wyss, *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 12 (Basel, 1976) pp. 59–60) and "Die Dichter der *Odyssee*," *Jahrbuch des Vereins Schweizer Gymnasiallehrer* 68 (1940), pp. 92–93 (=*Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, pp. 135–36). The conclusions reached here naturally go further.

half, after the loss of the fleet. In the case of the Underworld, it is self-evident that Odysseus was not allowed to travel this far with a fleet. Something so remote does not reveal itself to a crowd. In the case of the adventure with Circe, too many would be cast under her spell if the crew of a whole fleet were to fall into the trap of the enchantress: 250 pigs . . .

On the other hand no one would object if the cattle of the sun on Thrinakia were slaughtered by more, instead of just by the crew of one ship. And yet this adventure has its place between the Sirens and Skylla and Charybdis. Therefore, the grouping of these stories is not dictated only by the logic of the number of ships. Moreover, the poet sometimes ignores the logic of the numbers to such an extent that it is surprising that critics of Homer have not picked up on this a long time ago.

The *Aiolos* adventure is in the middle of those that Odysseus must survive with his fleet. And yet the fleet is no less impossible here than it would be in the adventure with the Sirens. Let us think about this. Finally Odysseus is sure of reaching his destination. He has tied up and captured all the evil winds in a sack, which he has hidden carefully in the lowest part of the ship's hold. He is sitting by the rudder himself, holding the sail, and never takes a rest. Already home is in sight—then sleep overcomes him. Then comes a discussion among his companions—their curiosity and their greed. So they open the sack. Punishment follows immediately on their folly. Forced back to Aiolos, Odysseus must see how the Lord of the Winds, who was so well-disposed shortly before, now shudders and turns away from him. But the very action of holding a conference, becoming outraged, and opening the bag of winds, is all only possible for the crew of one ship. Odysseus' worry, care, and caution is exercised only toward one ship. That they perished as a result of their own folly (10.27) can be said only about the crew of one ship. The men on the other eleven ships play not even the smallest role in all that happens either internally or externally. Let the audience forget the fleet just for this adventure! However clear the demands of this story, the poet has tolerated the presence of an accompanying fleet. Why has he put up with what seems so out of place to anyone examining the story carefully later? We search in vain for an answer in the story itself. Why did he not move this story into the second half?

And now for the third example, let us take the Cyclops. This also leaves no room for a fleet. If Odysseus chooses the twelve bravest men from his crew, then the crew of even one ship would be too many for the present danger of blinding the Cyclops and then of the daring escape. Equally the stones thrown by the blinded Cyclops at those trying to escape should not threaten more than one ship. And yet this adventure is the third in the series. But in this case the same poet who showed so little concern for the number of ships in the Aiolos story has had the foresight to remove the fleet from this story. He invented the island of the goats, lying in front of the coast of the Cyclopes, so that the fleet could lie at anchor there while Odysseus' ship proceeded to the adventure. More will be said later about the

"realistic" elements introduced into the adventure here. It is enough to note here that the rule about the number of ships is only confirmed by the exception, the story of Polyphemos.[4]

The question now is, from what adventures can the fleet not be removed? In fact the only ones remaining in this category are in the first place the Kikonians—it has already become clear that the poet of the *Odyssey* invented this story—and second the Laistrygones. Yet the latter adventure seems, from the way it is told, to be there for no other purpose than to explain the destruction of the fleet, with the exception of Odysseus' ship. But if one looks for fairy-tale elements here, then one discovers another story quite evidently invented later. In itself this adventure is one of the ogre stories, like the adventure of the Cyclops, except that this time Odysseus keeps himself out of the danger. The trap into which the three scouts fall is all the more terrifying. A king's daughter who is drawing water at a famous spring shows them the way—to the castle of the man-eating king. One man is eaten and the other two escape, but not, as expected, to report disaster. We do not find out what happens to them.[5]

Now the other part of the invention takes over, for the fleet has also already fallen into a trap by entering the narrow, rocky harbor in order to land. Now it is destroyed by the stones thrown by the giants. Only Odysseus has moored his ship outside the narrow inlet. Disaster strikes the heedless sailors here not purely as a result of the terrors of a fairy-tale wonder, but only when these are combined with the natural character of the coastline. The story of the man-eaters could probably have been told in a different way, without the destruction of the fleet. But the landscape here, a sinister landscape high in the extreme north, is described in such a way that the coast combined with the man-eating only makes sense in the place where it has been put in the *Odyssey*. Everything else, apart from Charybdis, can be switched around, but this cannot. From now on Odysseus is a different man from the one he was, the leader of only one ship.

If the only adventures from which the fleet cannot be removed are the Laistrygones and Kikonians, then the order is evidently not dependent on the number of ships. Whether an adventure tells of one or more ships depends on another order, according to which the numbers are adjusted. But, in the last analysis, what kind of a criterion of differentiation do we have to decide the arrangement of the stories?

It used to be thought that the ordering principle was geography, half

[4]Cf. also how in the Telemachy the fleet of Menelaos is eliminated because it would not have fitted in with the Proteus adventure, 3.298.

[5]There must have been much more here originally. The story of the giantess who invites a guest and of the giant who comes home in the evening and turns out to be a man-eater, is a widespread motif in ogre stories. See Leo Frobenius, *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 376f. and p. 388. But here this motif remains undeveloped. The contrast between grotesque and gruesome content and elevated epic form is characteristic of the poet. Out of different elements he has created a unity, which makes sense only in this context.

mythical but also half based on actual experience. Originally this was the hypothesis of Krates of Mallos, the leader of the Pergamene grammarians. He had already divided the wanderings to the different oceans into those of the far west and those of the far east and, where this principle is concerned, he has not lacked followers down to the present day. Yet here one must not ask what is the geography of the poet and what belongs to his tradition. Even without this differentiation the result is vague enough. One part of the adventures seems to take place in the far west and from there to Crete, another group in the northeast of the Aegean, and the Black Sea. Yet this happens without the two groups being really separate from each other, nor is it clear how the hero travels from west to east and again from east to west.[6]

If one avoids hypotheses, one conclusion is sure. The adventures are arranged in such a way by the poet that a fate is fashioned, a fate with three interweaving strands: first for the companions in the fleet, then for the single ship that is saved, and in the end only for Odysseus on his own. If we leave aside the last, brief and precipitous finale, the result is a double cycle of events. Twice we start off with relatively harmless adventures with a mild outcome, and twice things take a rapid turn to destruction. The first cycle comprises the Lotus Eaters, Polyphemos, Aiolos, and the Laistrygones. The second cycle includes Circe (the only adventure with a completely happy ending, apart from the Phaiakes), the Underworld, the Sirens, Skylla, the cattle of the sun, the storm at sea, and Charybdis. Each time Odysseus and his men bring the disaster on themselves. Although Poseidon is angry with Odysseus, our knowledge of ruin caused by sin directs our attention not to him but to Zeus. So on a higher level of causal connections, the authority of Zeus overshadows the wrath of Poseidon. Even the storm at sea in the first-person narrative is sent not by Poseidon but by Zeus.

In the ancient folk tradition before the *Odyssey*, the adventures were unconnected and the differentiation between a single ship and the whole fleet was missing. (One exception is the cattle of the sun, about which more later.) This lack of connection is generally characteristic of folk traditions. Similarly the old folktale collections about Eulenspiegel and Dr. Faust consist of a series of stories following on one another without a plan, only very loosely fitted into their biographical framework. An inner shape following the pattern of a life, fate, or climax, etc. is usually missing. The adventures of Sinbad also allow themselves to be interchanged. If this unity, which is composed of a meaningful order interweaving fate, fault, and the will of the gods and which holds the *Odyssey* together, is not out of place even in its world of fairy tale, how could the poet of these fairy-tale adventures not be

[6]W. Kranz, "Die Irrfahrten des Odysseus," *Hermes* 50 (1915), pp. 93f., manages to distinguish two distinct poems about wanderings by two different poets on the basis of geographical premises. There hardly seem to be any analyses that dispense with geographical considerations.

the same man who wove into the life story of his hero so much biographical material, so much that attests to the same order in the real world?

The First-Person Narrative

Another external device to see through the poetry to the tradition behind it, apart from the number of the ships, is available in the differences resulting from the transformation of the fairy-tale adventures into a first-person narrative. This transformation from the jesting and the dreadful wonders to the personal experience of a hero of the *Iliad* can still be spotted thanks to the transparence of the poetry. The purpose of this inquiry is not to break up the poem into either motifs or individual epics, but to understand the finished product as something growing from raw material, something that has been thought out. Meanwhile, let us leave the general question of the age and origins of the first-person narrative as a self-contained one.[7] Odysseus first becomes the narrator of his own adventures at the stage of our *Odyssey* and obviously, even in our poem, not by any means of all of them. The material that could be expanded and adapted to create an epic of the new style, fitted in with the conventions of epic. Material that resisted change was transformed into the first-person narrative. The first-person narrative is the means by which the old fairy-tale elements were absorbed into new epic, remote and at the same time true to life, distant fairy tales and yet personal experience. All this is quite obvious. Yet conclusions have hardly been drawn from it.

There are adventures that can easily be imagined without the first-person narrative. Others are so rooted in first-person narrative that the whole adventure would have to be taken apart to remove it. In other words the development from third-person to first-person narrative reaches different depths in different adventures. In some cases, although not in all, this also means a change of ethos and style.

An example of what still seems to be wholly fairy-tale in tone is the encounter with Skylla (12.201ff.). But anyone who thinks that to reconstitute the old fairy story it is enough to change the narrative from first person to

[7] Sinbad stories in the first-person narrative are already extant from the year 2000 in Egypt. See A. Wiedemann, *Altägyptische Sagen und Märchen* (Leipzig 1906), pp. 25f; L. Radermacher (above, note 1), p. 38. But in this case the adventurer is not a famous hero and the adventures are not intended to keep showing him in his own characteristic light. This new purpose doubtless required strict selection from among the abundance of the available wonder stories. The clashing rocks, for example, were no longer needed. The particular character of the hero could probably only be rendered in simple narrative and not in the first person. Self-characterization, in which the impression made by the adventures is transferred more and more to the narrator figure who survives them, is a very developed form. Many events, such as the end of the Sirens or the Phaiakes, could not be told at all in the first-person narrative. The parallel fairy tales, such as the numerous ones about Circe, demonstrate this same principle very clearly.

third, has completely missed noticing how a deeply ironic contrast gives the old fairy story its new tension in the *Odyssey*. The clash between the heroism of the *Iliad* and that of fairy tale is nowhere else represented with such a fantastic sense of horror. The terrors of fairy tale overcome even the worst horrors of the world of heroes with the same paralyzing force, just as here, after so many other adventures, the force of the fairy tale finally pulls all elements of epic, which are in its way, along with it. The encounter with Skylla turns into a triumph of the fairy-tale world over the reality of the *Odyssey*. The warning of Circe as she sees into the future is in vain (12.116ff.):

> Hardy man, your mind is full forever of fighting
> and battle work. Will you not give way even to the immortals?
> . . . . . .
> . . . . and there is no fighting against her,
> nor any force of defense. It is best to run away from her.

Odysseus gets into this adventure in a different way than anticipated. He probably warned his helmsman about the Rovers, following Circe's advice—it is part of the overriding care he feels for his crew that he does not tell him about Skylla—and yet the hero of the *Iliad* is not able to accept losses without a fight (12.226ff.):

> I let go from my mind the difficult instruction that Circe
> had given me, for she told me not to be armed for combat;
> but I put on my glorious armor and, taking up two long
> spears in my hands, I stood bestriding the vessel's foredeck
> at the prow, for I expected Skylla of the rocks to appear first
> from that direction, she who brought pain to my companions.

Meanwhile Charybdis is threatening opposite him from below, with such a terrible din, steam, and whirlpool, that he is not aware of Skylla grasping from above (12.244ff.):

> We in fear of destruction kept our eyes on Charybdis,
> but meanwhile Skylla out of the hollow vessel snatched six
> of my companions, the best of them for strength and hands' work.

Skylla and Charybdis probably originated as a twin adventure in their old fairy-tale context. Like the Rovers in the *Argonautica*, they lie opposite each other in a narrow strait, like double jaws.[8] But the hero of the *Odyssey* does not fall into the whirlpool of Charybdis as he comes from Skylla, but rather because he is paralyzed by the terror under and beside him, he forgets the terror over him. The result, instead of the effect of double jaws, is rather that of an incommensurability between the fairy-tale world and the heroism

[8] Regarding the common motif of the "clashing rocks," cf. L. Frobenius, *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes*, p. 405.

of the *Iliad*, for which the prophecies of Circe have already prepared the way. If Odysseus did not behave like a hero, and as the protector of his men, then this incommensurability would not become clear. Nowhere do we come across heroism that is so misplaced. The first-person form of the narrative is connected here with irony—even a little self-irony—that puts the old fairy-tale adventure in a new light. The hero becomes a victim of the contrast between two worlds. There are horrors that can only be suffered. At the same time it is clear why the Skylla adventure had to become separate and independent from the Charybdis adventure, for Charybdis has no part in the contrast intended here.

The transformation of the adventure of the Sirens seems to be less extensive. And yet even in such a short, unelaborated episode as this one there is a blending of the world of the *Iliad* and the fairy tales. Naturally this does not lead to their separation in an ironical contrast as in the Skylla adventure; rather, the purpose is to make the marvel of temptation even more tempting for the hero of the *Iliad*. The Sirens entice Odysseus with the prize of epic heroism, as if they had been waiting for no other purpose on their distant, fairy-tale cliff (12.184ff.):

> Come this way, honored Odysseus, great glory of the Achaians,
> . . . for we know everything that the Argives and Trojans
> did and suffered in wide Troy through the gods' despite.

The chord they must have struck in Odysseus' heart here is revealed, although in a very different setting, in the adventure with the Phaiakes, when the hero no longer holds back his tears at the fame of his deeds. But the man whose identity is not guessed there, sees himself recognized and celebrated here as soon as he approaches. The magical song becomes a heroic epic. The Sirens know the overwhelming effect of fame from the mouth of a poet. One is almost tempted to ask whether the companions would have been as irresistibly attracted as Odysseus, if they had no wax in their ears. Is there not a play on double meanings here with hearing and deafness? Yet if one tries to imagine the same story as epic narrative instead of in the first person, then one feels that the charm also is immediately gone.

> So they sang, in sweet utterance, and the heart within me
> desired to listen.
>
> (12.192–93)

If one replaces "within me" with "within him" here, then the invention does not hold. The introduction of the heroism of the *Iliad* into this story cannot be separated from the first-person narrative.

But the end of the adventure, as it was once told, has also changed. At one time it ended with the death of the Sirens, just as the adventure in Scheria concluded with the end of the Phaiakes. On a red-figure vase from the end of the sixth century in the possession of the British Museum (just as

already on a vase sherd about one hundred years older from Naucratis), the Sirens, portrayed as monster birds with human heads, throw themselves into the sea from their high nest on the cliff, as Odysseus passes them by.[9] The same story is reported in the parallel tradition, which goes back to Timaeus, the historian of the West, that is to say, it goes back to the fourth century. They did this "in desperation at their defeat," or because it had been prophesied to them as their fate, that they would live as long as no mortal withstood their song. Try to imagine this ending in the first-person narrative: "As soon as we had passed beyond them and out of earshot, I already saw how they threw themselves into the sea." One can see that the transformation could not accommodate this. In the experiences of Odysseus, there is no more room for the fate of the Sirens.

The landscape has also changed in the *Odyssey*. In the version of the vase-painters, the Sirens do not sing on an inviting "meadow," but on a high cliff, and the tradition preserved by Timaeus agrees with this. The vase-painters evidently also imagined a narrow strait, like the one between Skylla and Charybdis. Their song becomes even more inescapable, if it is not only a question of sailing past it, but through it and under it.

The source for Timaeus and the vase-painters is the folk tradition. The idea that Odysseus outwits the Sirens is lost in our *Odyssey*, if only because Odysseus is following the advice of Circe, instead of coming up with a way of breaking their spell on the spur of the moment from his own fund of tricks. Originally cunning was matched by cunning. But the song of the Sirens was also cunning. Cunning and magic went hand in hand. This is also the case with the song of Circe.

Naturally the Sirens do not suspect that the rowers have wax in their ears. Otherwise they would have spared themselves the trouble. And they probably have even less understanding of the meaning of the man who is tied to the mast. They only see that their magic no longer works. They do not suspect the powerful effect it is actually having. In that picture on the vase, one Siren, Himeropa, is still making an effort, bewildered and beating her wings, while her sister has already given up and is throwing herself into the sea with a look of despair. In the new context of the *Odyssey*, the victory of the man of many schemes, his successful outwitting of the Sirens and his breaking of their spell, which no one has ever been able to withstand yet, becomes his suffering and escape. Do the Sirens remain the same as they were? We are not supposed to ask this. The significance of the adventure of the Sirens comes from its position in the *Odyssey* as a whole.

[9] Illustrations and evidence can be found in H. W. Roscher's *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, s.v. "Seirenen," by G. Weicker. Other material is in E. Bethe, "Die griechische Dichtung," in O. Walzel's *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft* (Wildbad-Potsdam, 1924), p. 39. Illustrations there are after the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 13. For the significance of the Sirens as wonderful and alluring demons of death, cf. also E. Buschor, *Die Musen des Jenseits* (Munich, 1944), p. 7. The Sirens' Promontory opposite Capri and the Sirenum Petrae east of it at Positano show that they were thought to have been there probably since Timaeus.

LANDSCAPE

We speak of *Odyssey* landscapes, not of *Iliad* landscapes, and there is a good reason for this. Landscape is something native to this poet. However, his landscapes do not play a role like those in the novels of more modern times, as a mirror or background to the lives and moods of the characters. They are a part of the same sequence as the fairy-tale wonders, although with the difference that they do not need heightened or magic elements to be a wonder. Homeric landscapes have the same relationship to magic lands as a sea storm in Homer has to the fairy-tale adventure of the Charybdis. They come into being, shedding traditional forms, just as biography springs from fairy-tale adventures. Like the human being or spirit, the landscape is also an element that is latent in mythology, as if asleep, and that one morning wakes up to its own potential.

The fact that the cave of Polyphemos simultaneously conjures up such a picture of the south in our imagination, that it almost seems to have a bucolic or Theocritean connection, is not least the result of the small island of the goats, which is situated right in front of it. The island serves as its foreground and foil. It frames the adventure with the ogres, which takes place behind it, in such a way that little needs to be added in order to locate it completely in a landscape. The idyll comes before the adventure. And yet it was necessity that forced the poet to place this island in front of the coast. Through this island he frees himself for this adventure of the fleet which he invented as an addition. He makes himself a virtue of necessity. Nowhere else in the *Odyssey* is landscape described in such detail for its own sake. Nothing happens except that they hunt a few goats. Otherwise there is just the landing and the sight of untouched land, and wild, flourishing nature. They look over at the coast nearby, where they see smoke rising up. From there adventure tempts them.

Many aspects of the landing, the utter darkness of the night, their inability to see the coast, and the calm of the wind in the natural harbor suggest the beginning of disaster. Is it not like the Laistrygones? But no, morning comes and, behold, a marvel! It is not so very far from here to Claude Lorrain, although we should not forget the Augustans as a stage in between. Just as they are somewhat influenced by Italian agriculture, so here this picture is affected by the spirit of early Greek colonization.

Is it a coincidence that the purest landscapes, like this one and the one at the beginning of the Circe adventure, are in the story that is retold by Odysseus? In the direct narrative, in the case of Kalypso and the Phaiakes, there is no lack of an audience; the guide, the slayer of Argos, stood and marveled (5.75). But the godlike sufferer Odysseus stood still and marveled (7.133). In the indirect narrative, this is left out. As a result the whole episode becomes all the more of an experience. The first-person narrative first creates the opportunity for the marvels of the landscape to emerge completely from myth. Let us test this theory:

There is a wooded island that spreads, away from the harbor,
neither close in to the land of the Cyclopes nor far out
from it; forested; wild goats beyond number breed there,
for there is no coming and going of human kind to disturb them,
nor are they visited by hunters, who in the forest
suffer hardships as they haunt the peaks of the mountains,
neither again is it held by herded flocks, nor farmers,
but all its days, never plowed up and never planted,
it goes without people and supports the bleating wild goats.
For the Cyclopes have no ships with cheeks of vermilion,
nor have they builders of ships among them, who could have made them
strong-benched vessels, and these if made could have run them sailing
to all the various cities of men, in the way that people
cross the sea by means of ships and visit each other,
and they could have made this island a strong settlement for them.
For it is not a bad place at all, it could bear all crops
in season, and there are meadow lands near the shores of the gray sea,
well watered and soft; there could be grapes grown there endlessly,
and there is smooth land for plowing, men could reap a full harvest
always in season, since there is very rich subsoil. Also
there is an easy harbor, with no need for a hawser
nor anchor stones to be thrown ashore nor cables to make fast;
one could just run ashore and wait for the time when the sailors'
desire stirred them to go and the right winds were blowing.
Also at the head of the harbor there runs bright water,
spring beneath rock, and there are black poplars growing around it.
There we sailed ashore, and there was some god guiding
us in through the gloom of the night, nothing showed to look at,
for there was a deep mist around the ships, nor was there any moon
showing in the sky, but she was under the clouds and hidden.
There was none of us there whose eyes had spied out the island,
and we never saw any long waves rolling in and breaking
on the shore, but the first thing was when we beached the well-benched
vessels.
Then after we had beached the ships, we took all the sails down,
and we ourselves stepped out onto the break of the sea beach,
and there we fell asleep and waited for the divine Dawn.
But when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers,
we made a tour about the island, admiring everything
there, and the nymphs, daughters of Zeus of the aegis, started
the hill-roving goats our way for my companions to feast on.

(9.116–55)

Odysseus is almost as excited as if he wanted to become a colonist. But like praise of his home, praise of the wilderness also depends on the person

speaking. Without the first-person narrative there is no landscape. Although the homeland Ithaka is additionally endowed with a few details of landscape, here the olive tree, there the cave of the nymphs, these are only identification points and as such they have less significance in themselves. There are also landscape elements rendered as part of the description of the journey, but again only in the case of Odysseus, only around him, as his experience. How often Telemachus comes and goes on the same roads in Ithaka, which only really become part of a journey when Odysseus travels on them. It is the same in the case of the weather. Only personal experience, only the first-person narrative lends the fairy-tale landscape an awareness of its splendor and magic.

Polyphemos

The cave of Polyphemos is the only place among the fairy-tale adventures where Odysseus comes not as a sufferer, but willingly and knowingly. In no other case does he feel himself so attracted by danger. In Circe's realm he also sees smoke rising in the distance. But at that point adventure no longer tempts him. He sends out his companions to follow the rising smoke on Circe's island because he has lost his bearings, and he no longer knows in which direction between sunrise and sunset his home lies. By contrast nothing forces him to push onward from the goat island, which offers him everything that he needs, to the coast of the Cyclopes opposite. Indeed he has a premonition of what lies before him. He chooses his men accordingly and he takes along with him the magic wine against all eventualities. He is attacked by the Laistrygones because he innocently tries to find out what kind of people inhabit their land. Nothing like that happens here. He knows that the Cyclopes live over there. The meeting with this giant in the *Odyssey* does not happen in the same way as in the satyr play by Euripides. There Odysseus lands in order to fetch water and provisions, and then, to his dismay, he finds himself facing the monster. The invention of the dramatist shows, if there is still need for it, how easily the epic poet could have found a different motive for the adventure, if he had wanted to.

The feeling of wonder at the unusual elements, at the careful dairy farming of this ruthless monster, at the love for his animals felt by the man-eater, at the arrangement of the cave and of the world in which he lives and moves, at his transformation from being defeated to cursing demonically—all these qualities rightly make this adventure stand out from the rest. But they should not entice us to see a separate poem in this. This adventure is the freshest because it is the first. The Kikonians, who precede it, serve only as a preparation for this, and the Lotus Eaters show that now they are traveling into a fairy-tale land. Here Odysseus sets out to meet danger, in a world of wonders that is just opening up before him, with an undampened zeal that will naturally fade soon enough. What a different person he is

inside in the Circe adventure, which starts in a similar way. Odysseus survives all the subsequent adventures, which are summarized in Circe's prophecy, merely as suffering imposed as part of the manifold demands of his fate. The Odysseus who finally reaches Scheria and in the end his home, begins to wail before he knows where he is. One may ask whether this is the same hero and whether the creation of the same poet, as the man who meets Polyphemos with such daring. The answer to this question is yes, because his many adventures have changed him. The answer to this question would only be no if the Polyphemos story were not the first in a long chain, if the adventures did not lead to a climax in their order and significance, just as they do in our *Odyssey*. In fact, according to everything that can be gathered about the plan of our *Odyssey*, these stories were put together in this series for the first time here. The Polyphemos adventure can only serve as a warning example because it is the first one, exemplifying the complete fearlessness and inexperience of the start of the journey.

But if Odysseus is transformed from someone who delights in adventure to someone who survives it and finally to a man who fears adventure, we in turn notice a parallel development in the life of the adventurer, who has no part in fairy tale anymore, and whom Odysseus pretends to be for Eumaios. In addition, this life-story could not start with such pleasure in dangers and adventure if it did not end with such weariness. But the question as to whether it is still the same becomes unnecessary because of the logic of the story. In his youth he was so daring:

> Ares and Athene endowed me with courage, that power
> that breaks men in battle. Whenever I detailed the best fighters
> to go into ambush, planning evil things for the enemy,
> the proud heart in me had no image of death before it, . . .
> but now I wish I had died and met my destiny
> there in Egypt, for there was still more sorrow awaiting me.
>
> (14.216–19 . . . , 274–75)

The one who was once so eager for booty ends up as booty himself, tied up to be sold as a slave (14.337f):

> but their hearts were taken with a bad counsel
> concerning me, so I still should have the pain of affliction.

And when he escapes once more, his life is a matter of simply surviving:

> . . . So now life is still my portion.
>
> (14.359)

Since one would hardly be inclined to see the one as the model for the other, we must recognize the same poet in both sequences.

But the urge that impels Odysseus to wait for the giant—which makes

the start of this adventure different from the others—is surely strange. He wishes to "test" and "find out" what kind of people the Cyclopes are,

> whether they are savage and violent, and without justice
> or hospitable to strangers and with minds that are godly.
>
> (9.175–76)

Where else does he feel this urge? As far as I know, only in Ithaka, when he dresses up as a beggar and tests nobles and people, servants and maids. He designs his plan as one who is testing (16.304f.) and takes action as Athene advises him (13.303ff.). Yet who gives him this task in relation to the Cyclops? In fact, the testing has another significance here: it leads to an ironic clash between the two worlds, the one from which Odysseus is coming and the one he is now entering. He is testing as a hero of the *Iliad*, who is accustomed to receive the highest honors and the richest guest-presents everywhere because of his rank and fame. The reply to this is the eating of his companions. And it almost seems to us that this completely alien behavior, however horrible it is, does challenge the standards of heroism for the moment. For what other reason is there that Odysseus does not put himself in this position as a hero of the *Iliad* at any other time? How he flatters in attesting his loyalty! How pathetic!

> We claim we are of the following of the son of Atreus,
> Agamemnon, whose fame now is the greatest thing under heaven,
> such a city was that he sacked and destroyed so many
> people; but now we come to you and are suppliants.
>
> (9.263ff.)

The collapse of his self-image seems to be of almost the same kind as what occurs when the hero of the *Iliad* faces the grasping tentacles of Skylla with his weapons and armor. The play on the contradictions between the two worlds is the same. It need hardly be said that here also this game coincides with the transformation of the objectivity of fairy tale into the subjectivity of a first-person narrative.

For the story is no longer told in a naive way.[10] The irony results from the fact that Odysseus sets out into this world as the one with the upper hand, the one who is confident in himself and puts others to the test. And yet this world hardly withstands his testing. The heroic, knightly world of the warriors of the *Iliad* is also a civilized one. When Odysseus appears before the giant as the representative of this world, a more sophisticated tension is added to the basic one. Once told merely as outwitting a trick, the adventure now becomes a battle between civilization teamed up with intelligence,

[10] For the fairy-tale motifs in the Polyphemos adventure, cf. Friedrich v. d. Leyen, *Das Märchen* (Leipzig, 1925[3]), 104f. (Heidelberg, 1958[4], p. 127). Wilhelm Grimm, *Die Sage von Polyphem, Abhandlung der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1857), *Kleine Schriften IV,* pp. 428f. Meuli, *Odyssee und Argonautika* (Berlin, 1921), pp. 66f.

and barbarity allied with raw strength. What will be the outcome? The initial result is that Odysseus falls into a terrible trap.

The play between the contrasting elements of two worlds is mixed up with Odysseus outwitting the trick of the Cyclops—something unthinkable without the first-person narrative. The same play of tensions results in the disappointment of the blinded Cyclops that his conqueror, who had long been foretold to him, should turn out to be such a wretch: "I always thought that he would be someone like myself." The biggest change in the meaning of the whole adventure is brought about by the contrast between the two worlds. Through this Odysseus takes on the role of testing and in the end he boasts that he is the victor through the favor and care of the same Zeus, the protector of strangers, in whose name he undertook this adventure. In his triumph he calls out to his enemy from his ship, when he is barely out of reach, that he has suffered a just punishment (9.478f.):

> Hard one, who dared to eat your own guests in your own house,
> so Zeus and the rest of the gods have punished you.

And then, after surviving the danger, in the midst of his companions, he ceremonially sacrifices the ram that carried him out of the cave as a thank-offering to Zeus "the dark-clouded son of Kronos, lord over all." And Zeus?

> But he was not moved by my offerings,
> but still was pondering on a way how all my strong-benched
> ships should be destroyed and all my eager companions.
>
> (9.553–55)

The foreshadowing takes place in the style of the great heroic epic. A model for this deception is in the *Iliad*. The kings and people, Danaans and Dardanians, are in a similar situation of error in *Iliad* 3.298ff. at the most solemn sacrifice and prayer.

> "Zeus, exalted and mightiest, and you other immortals,
> let those, whichever side they may be, who do wrong to the oaths sworn
> first, let their brains be spilled on the ground as this wine is spilled now,
> theirs and their sons', and let their wives be the spoil of others."
> They spoke, but none of this would the son of Kronos accomplish.

The fruitless prayer of Hecabe (*Il.* 6.305ff.) is the same:

> She spoke in prayer, but Pallas Athene turned her head from her.
>
> (*Il.* 6.311)

The sacrifice of the Trojans is the same also at *Iliad* 8.550f. And yet there is a difference. When Zeus makes himself deaf to entreaties in the *Iliad*, the reason is not that there was some fault in the prayers, and the humans are deceived because of their simple, honest trust in the gods. The refusal of the

gods to listen borders on betrayal. Just as the *Iliad* is full of this, so the *Odyssey* intentionally avoids it.[11] Zeus himself rules this out in the council of the gods in the first book. Not even the Suitors, feeling that they have been betrayed, turn to the gods. The only exception, this sacrifice of the ram by Odysseus, should be assessed very differently, according to all the indications. Naturally, Odysseus is not in the wrong here in the sense of "sin," as his companions later sin on Thrinakia, and yet he is in the wrong in his triumph and in his enjoyment of the victory (how different it is when he forbids Eurycleia to triumph in victory after his completed revenge) and in his delusion that he is carrying out a task without being instructed to by a god. Yet his delusion, as human delusion, is quite different from that of a hero in the *Iliad*. When Odysseus errs, the irony of his mistake is subjectively conditioned. He only errs as far as he himself is concerned. When people pray and make a mistake in the *Iliad*, then their mistake is objective, and the irony of its rests on the inscrutability and contrary nature of the gods.

Despite all of its own brilliance, the Polyphemos story does play a part in the picture of a life as a whole. It has more than just the outward function of providing a motive for the wrath of Poseidon. It leads to the stage where humans and their values, both blameless in themselves, begin to become questionable to each other. As surely as Odysseus represents humanity, and as surely as the man-eater despises all that is right, there is a human element mixed into the judgment, which does not pass the test of the gods: namely hybris, although in its most subtle form, hybris as moral awareness. Not that this would be made clear. Self-representation, in the objectivity of the available means, is a wonder of foreshadowing narrative both subjectively and objectively. At first a fairy tale, as exciting as fairy tales are, the Polyphemos story ends almost like a novel or biography. At first glance it seems the brightest of all the adventures, but in fact it is the darkest of all. It casts its shadow over the rest of the sequence.[12]

The Wrath of Poseidon

The story of Polyphemos ends with two opposing scenes, which parallel each other in the style of great epic. On the one hand is the curse of the vanquished, on the other the thank-offering of the victor. Here is Poseidon who listens, there Zeus who is planning destruction. In this way days of

[11] *Od.* 12.371ff. should not be cited here, because Odysseus is the only one who is saved from destruction, and he is not guilty of the sacrilege of his companions.

[12] The newest analysis that I am aware of is by Friedrich Focke, *Die Odyssee* (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1943). He differentiates between the Cyclops adventure and the Aiolos adventure, including the "adventure poem" (books 10–12). He attributes the latter to the poet of the *Odyssey* and the former to a particular, older poem (p. 185). In his book the connections referred to here remain without explanation.

battle in the *Iliad* end with the opposing expectations of the Trojans and Achaians. But how much further the consequences reach here, how much more inscrutable are the reasons! The person who is now vanquished becomes the victor one day, and the victor the victim, but without a scene between the gods, as in the *Iliad*, which explains the position of both gods.

The sacrifice and the curse both point in the same way to what is to come. The sacrifice foreshadows the loss of the ship and the crew, the curse something more distant, which the blinded Cyclops asks for. What Poseidon grants him is the same in its result as what Zeus is planning, that is, to spoil the victor's victory. But how is it that Zeus has the same thing in mind as Poseidon? Of course, the reasons that both have are not the same. Poseidon, naturally, thinks, as it were, in a more primitive way; he is angry and outraged for the sake of his son. Zeus turns away from the sacrifice because the fulfillment of judgment in his name does not fit in with this intention. He is angry for the sake of Odysseus. This makes their unanimity and their preordained harmony even more curious.

People used to think that there were two moral codes here, two layers of belief superimposed on each other, that is to say, an older one according to which a god takes revenge and a more recent one in which a god, now Zeus instead of Poseidon, punishes a transgression. The former was seen in the curse of Polyphemos, and the latter in the adventure on Thrinakia. But people did not stop at this; rather, in contrasting two sequences of causation, they separated out two poets: an older one who would have written about the wrath of Poseidon and a more recent one who dealt with the intervention of Zeus.[13] But is the curse of Polyphemos imaginable without the thanksgiving and victory sacrifice of Odysseus? Can one picture one god listening to a prayer without the other one's denial? Does it make sense for a second, more recent poet to add the vital connection that made one part relate to the other? Is it possible that each poet was trying to write his own imitation of the *Iliad*—or something like the *Iliad*—and that their model was only equaled by a combination of these different poems?

If we ask how the plans of these two gods actually *work*, then we find out that, in relation to the importance accorded to the wrath of Poseidon, the number of places in which he is mentioned is very small. Zeus is mentioned much more often. The first place is in the council of the gods in the first book, which imitates the *Iliad* in motif and style. Poseidon is not present at the assembly because he is taking part in the sacrifices of the Ethiopians. For the same reasons Zeus and all the other gods are not on Olympus in the first book of the *Iliad*. Here, as in the *Iliad*, this gives space for a digression, although here it is a much more extensive one, namely on both Kalypso and the voyage of Telemachus.

[13] Cf. the remarks of Rudolf Pfeiffer (which are correct in many respects) in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 49 (1928), c. 2362 [reprinted in Pfeiffer, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich, 1960), p. 15]. Focke, in *Die Odyssee*, pp. 247f., did not convince me.

The council of the gods ends with a surprise. If one is moving from the general to the particular, from the example to its application, then Athene's impatience finally anticipates the others asking, "If this is so, then why is this the fate of Odysseus?" Zeus' reply is: "If Poseidon were not angry about the blinding of his son, then help would have come to Odysseus a long time before. So let us all think about how he is to return home. Poseidon cannot maintain his wrath alone against everyone." And already Athene is ready: "Let us send Hermes to Kalypso! Meanwhile I . . . ," and she is already putting on her sandals. Without a "Telemachy" the busy goddess would be idle, she would have to wait, until—well, until when? She would have to wait until Poseidon had retreated after the storm at sea, and for a very modest role at that! She smooths out the sea in his wake—in all this takes six lines. She takes the initiative. With this she begins her move against Poseidon, although at a great distance still. Her sphere of influence is Ithaka.

Then comes the second surprise: after the first day we imagine that meanwhile something is happening on Olympus—only to hear suddenly, in the fifth book, that still nothing has been done. We find out that even the decisions of the gods can be delayed. Athene presents her case again, pointing to the deterioration of the situation: on the one hand the indolence of the people in Ithaka, on the other Odysseus with Kalypso and, on top of all this, his son now in extreme danger! And Zeus? He answers with the same, slightly bemused question as on the first day: "O, what a word, my child . . . ? Did you not yourself want all this? You must take care of Telemachus now, for you are able." And as if everything were in the best hands, he now takes the necessary steps for the first time. (Meanwhile concern for Telemachus is delayed here in the same way that concern for Odysseus was after the first council of the gods.)

It is the misunderstanding of a philologist to assume that here the poet had tried to carry on two different actions happening at the same time and had lost control of his material. The second council is not simply a repetition. In it Athene becomes the one who makes her own decisions, and as a result, she becomes Poseidon's opponent. Only her actions lead to a situation where Zeus *must* help immediately, if matters are not to end in disaster. Only in the second council do we reach that "almost" point, the danger of a situation that has not been thought out, so typical of quarrels between the gods in the *Iliad*. The first one could be wide-reaching and leisurely but the second takes place under pressure from the new situation. The repeated lines (5.8ff. = 2.230ff.; 5.14ff. = 4.557ff.) are like recommitments. Only now one thing leads to another and everything is more urgent. Athene: "Odysseus does not even have a ship to sail in!" Zeus in answer: "Let him sail on a raft!" (The same lines are made to refer to each other, 5.14f. and 4.557f.; there the impossibility of returning home, here the solution to the puzzle). Now, for the first time, the control of the highest ruler of the heavens is set a task. If his order is something of a prophecy—he foresees

the repetition—that is not a reason to object to it: his orders do come to pass.

But what would come of all this without the wrath of Poseidon? The invention of his anger carries the whole action up to the level of Olympus.

In the storm at sea in the fifth book, Poseidon is the opponent of Athene in the style of the *Iliad*. And yet there is a difference here also. When one goes, the other comes, and so Athene's eagerness, which has just been demonstrated, reveals her restraint. The more she dares to do on Ithaka, the less in his domain. This move and countermove, this opposition to each other and yet yielding and giving in to each other, with Zeus over all, allowing and directing, is part of the schema of the poem and of the world, as the poet sees it.

The next and last time Poseidon intervenes, he turns the ship of the Phaiakes to stone (13.125ff.). Here again there is a scene with the gods of the type in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 20.13f., 8.445, 15.185, 4.37). The prophecy of Alkinoos (13,175), which does not involve a scene with the gods, has no knowledge of the wrath or its cause. What this means will be discussed later.

In the actual fairy-tale adventures, Poseidon nowhere appears as the enemy, with one exception: Teiresias points to him in the Nekyia. But as soon as the wrath is mentioned, the punishment decreed by Zeus follows immediately again. Teiresias' prophecy and the curse of Polyphemos are interdependent both in language and content. We are told twice (1.20 and 6.330) that Poseidon's wrath does not relent. But where do the adventures show this? When Odysseus is held captive by Kalypso for seven years, then that is Kalypso's fault and not Poseidon's. The "daemon" (7.248) leads him to her. Circe and Kalypso account for over eight years. Is Poseidon's wrath supposed to have rested all this time? Moreover, Odysseus has been blown off course long before Polyphemos curses him. If there is no need for Poseidon's wrath to reach the Lotus Eaters and the Cyclopes, then it is not needed for the adventures of the Sirens and Charybdis. If the council of the gods were not to take place until *after* the adventures rather than where the poet wants it, then the wrath of the god would lack every reason. But surely we should not make calculations.

Yet even without calculating, we can see that Poseidon's wrath is not mentioned for so long because the adventures have their own magic. Not only Thrinakia, but all the others clash with Poseidon's wrath in the same way. What would happen to Aiolos if we think of the angry Poseidon? But also the Sirens, Skylla and Charybdis, even the Underworld, would all be stripped of their own magic qualities by the wrath of Poseidon. When seen as a fate dependent on Zeus, all this can be understood as a unity or sequence, just as, for example, the eye of Sinbad the sailor is always directed to Allah in all his crises. But the wrath and character of Poseidon surely does not do this.

The conclusion to be drawn is that Poseidon's wrath is there for the sake

of the action of the gods. It is a given element in the style of great epic and prescribed by the genre of the *nostos*. Just as the fleet of the Achaians is buffeted by the anger of Athene (5.108), and just as Locrian Ajax is destroyed by the rage of Poseidon (4.502), so Odysseus is threatened with the same fate. Poseidon's wrath is a link, not a story that can be told in itself, neither as the end of an adventure nor without any reference to Zeus. The storm at sea makes it into great poetry. And the storm in its turn is required by the poetic genre of the *nostos*. But above all, the wrathful god is the opponent of the helping goddess. Consequently, the whole is articulated into two parts, each of which is subject to its own god.

But a poem is not simply a composition. One can hardly maintain that the end of the Cyclops adventure is on a more primitive level of belief than the adventure on Thrinakia. The fact that Poseidon brings about something, which fits in with the will of Zeus, takes on an even greater significance because it is against all the rules of the game for gods in the *Iliad*. Here the will of both gods *coincides* until their last scene, at 13.125ff. They take each other into consideration, although Zeus naturally does this in a different way than Poseidon. In Poseidon's wrath there is a negative element. He simply wants his rights as a god. He is not concerned with anything else that happens. But even his negative side is subject to the great positive element, which is Zeus. Zeus allows him to have his way, although his wrath affects the whole.

If the world experience of the *Iliad* is the result of a battle in which Zeus remains victorious despite all setbacks, then the fates of the *Odyssey* are decided by a game of opposing and yielding, which leaves Zeus as the one on top, the one to whose will all the other gods submit. The mystery of this coincidence of will, with which we started, in which Zeus and Poseidon both aim for the same goal while each is thinking something different, points to a theological background of the poetry.

Aiolos and the Laistrygones

In the adventure of the Laistrygones, we miss the storytelling element, finding it undeveloped, dark, and crude. This is actually quite understandable, as long as we do not take it as the conclusion to the Aiolos story that comes before it. In order to do this, we must first differentiate between tradition and fresh composition, between old and new, in the Aiolos story.

What elevates the Aiolos story so far above everything more primitive is surely not the misfortune of letting the winds out of their prison, but rather the contrast between Odysseus' first and his second reception, that is to say, his failure to repeat his initial experience. It is remarkable how the epic poet, who portrayed the Cyclops' cave so vividly, in this case denies himself any elaboration of the fantasy elements, such as the palace, the cave of the winds, etc., that the floating island and its king had to offer for his imagina-

tion. He does this in order to bring out, with even greater force, the single contrast on which he has made everything depend. If he wanted to indulge in the fairy-tale elements, then the drama and the new meaning of the story, which was his own addition to the fairy-tale adventures, would be lost.

The more this story is lacking in vivid elements when compared with the Polyphemos story, the more it surpasses the latter in terms of economy. Because of the two acts, into which the whole story is divided, this fairy tale reaches a climax, of the kind usually thought to be originally suited to a novella. A comparison can be made with the two-part novellas in Herodotus, such as the one about Croesus or Pythios (7.27, 38). More and more we see that the aim of the story is to make clear that the worst of it is not the storm caused by the winds rushing out of the sack, nor the uselessness of all his efforts—although Odysseus would very much like to throw himself into the sea because of this (the usual Sinbad-motif)—rather, the worst of it is what this all means: that as Odysseus is hated and cursed by the gods, so Aiolos in his castle must increasingly become the perfect example of the man whom the gods love: "beloved by the immortal gods" (10.2). For this reason and for this reason alone, the poet attends us at the beginning with things that are quite different from what we expect.

What we are expecting can be seen in Virgil. In the *Aeneid* (1.50ff.) the castle is described and in the hill under the castle, the cave of the monsters, the dungeon of the winds, and how Aiolos rules them with a strong hand, letting them in and out. But none of this is here. At the beginning we do not even find out that Aiolos is the King of the Winds. We hear about this for the first time when he gives his guest-present. What different issues come into the foreground instead! While the winds in the *Iliad* are in very high spirits as a group and eager for feminine beauty as they meet for feasting on their home ground (Il. 23.200f.), here the Lord of the Winds becomes the embodiment of domestic harmony. The poet of the *Odyssey* never tires of praising the happiness of marriage, but nowhere in his poetry does it appear with such fairy-tale qualities as here. The man whom the gods love gave his six daughters in marriage to his own six sons. So their days are one long feast, accompanied by unceasing song and music on stringed instruments, and their nights are all nights of love. They are more intense versions of the Phaiakes. (Reports of marriages between siblings in distant dynasties may have contributed, but that is not what is meant). And the man whom the gods love becomes the guest-friend of the wanderer and keeps him lovingly according to the rules of the most select guest-friendship, as we have learned to understand it in the Telemachy. He keeps him no longer and no shorter than is suitable, and when he is sending him on his way, he does this in accordance with tradition, not without a guest-present. In this case, to distinguish it from all the other times, the guest-present is the most precious thing that Aiolos has to give—the sack, in which the winds are trapped. Here, for the first time, we hear about his sovereignty: "For the son of Kronos had set him in charge over the winds." Does the old fairy-

tale element not appear as a surprise in this transformed version? Is what used to be the main point not delayed to the end, for the sake of the new meaning?

The concern of the king is so far-reaching that he ties up his gift himself in the hollow of the ship with a silver string, with the same care that Alkinoos shows when he himself takes care of stowing his guest-present in the ship's hold (13.20). The second departure is all the more terrible, since the first one was so very kind.

For the sake of this repetition, the poet has accepted that the winds rushing out of the sack do not unleash a huge storm, as we expect. Nor do they scatter the twelve ships, as in Virgil, but rather these quickly land back where they started, so that they put ashore and eat their meal. For the second time Odysseus sets out, only this time he takes two companions with him and sits meekly on the floor by the entrance, while the same carefree feasting is going on inside. And then comes the answer, in direct speech, that unexpected ending, which is probably much more the model for Schiller's *Ring des Polykrates* than Herodotus, but how much more unprecedented as a gesture! (10.64ff.):

> "What brings you back, Odysseus? What evil spirit has vexed you?
> We sent you properly on your way, so you could come back
> to your own country and house and whatever else is dear to you."
> So they spoke, and I though sorry at heart answered:
> "My wretched companions brought me to ruin, helped by the pitiless
> sleep. Then make it right, dear friends; for you have the power."
> So I spoke to them, plying them with words of endearment,
> but they were all silent; only the father found words and answered:
> "O least of living creatures, out of this island! Hurry!
> I have no right to see on his way, none to give passage
> to any man whom the blessed gods hate with such bitterness.
> Out. This arrival means you are hateful to the immortals."

An enemy of the gods is a man for whom mercy turns into disaster. It is part of the nature of a curse that it is pronounced without warning. Nowhere else are Odysseus' eyes opened in this way. What he did not know, when he sacrificed the ram to Zeus Xenios after surviving the Cyclops adventure, he now knows: that the prayer of the blinded Cyclops was heard rather than his own.[14] This new ending, to which the whole adventure is now tailored, points both to the past and the future. The Aiolos story is not there for its own sake; one cannot stop after it. The tension it leaves behind points to what follows, the adventure of the Laistrygones. This story in turn, which is the more spooky as it is unelaborated and without any epic detail, takes our breath away with the breakneck speed of its unfolding. It

[14] *Contra* Focke, *Die Odyssee*, p. 187: "The gruff dismissal of the returning voyagers lacks a poetically satisfying explanation."

answers the question that the Aiolos story left open. There is no word of explanation about Odysseus' carefulness. Anything additional would impede the speed that keeps going until the end, that ending that forms the great caesura in the rhythm of adventures (10.131f.):

> Gladly *my* ship, and only mine, fled out from the overhanging
> cliffs to the open water, but the others were all destroyed there.

In the translations the antithesis and the final character of the second line generally do not emerge. They were composed by the same poet, who invented a fleet to go with the one ship, the same man who diverted the ending of the Aiolos story into a curse. The result is that he has added a surprise of a different kind to the surprises in the fairy tales: the surprise created by a fate carried out in accordance with the will of the gods.

In the first series of adventures, Odysseus obviously cannot be completely absolved of some part in the destruction of the fleet. Clearly he does not have a share of the guilt in a literal sense, but in that difficult and obscure sense, which can be surmised from the adventure of the Cyclops. In the second series he becomes all the more innocent.

Circe and Kalypso

Philologists do not have a very high opinion of the Circe adventure. Their opinion is that although the legend is old and good, the poet of this story is a latecomer, someone who worked on and imitated the material of others, a poet who owes whole sections down to the last letter to the inventor of Kalypso, a poet who should be valued all the more disproportionately higher. Eduard Schwartz, following Wilamowitz, feels: "To an even greater extent than heroic greatness, human greatness has been lost. The relationship with Kalypso is of such purity, such as is only revealed to poets of originality, who discover the depths of human hearts: the Circe adventure is not far removed from a Milesian tale."[15]

In making a charge of base sensuality, they clearly overlook the rhythm of the story. They overlook how little, in comparison with fairy tales, pleasure in love is picked out as the goal of the adventure. The story almost passes over it. First it stops, and it only comes to its climax and changes its situation after they enjoy the pleasures of love. Odysseus, wonderfully washed and dressed by elfin hands, is sitting opposite Circe and is gloomy and silent, after the preparation of all the fantastic, good things—all this is used in the service of creating a feeling of tension. The spell is not broken until Odysseus' comrades are changed back.

One cannot aim at two effects at the same time in the same story, or the

[15] Eduard Schwartz, *Die Odyssee*, p. 270. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884), pp. 115f. P. Von der Mühll, "*Odyssee*."

story will not be effective. To demand that the magic of Circe would have to be described with the same enchantment as the grotto of Kalypso or with the same charming bucolic surroundings as the cave of Polyphemos, in order to have been composed by the same poet, is to set a goal that was not the aim in this case. Before one provides that the creator of Kalypso and Polyphemos would not have been the kind of poet to want what was intended here, one will not be able to deny him the Circe adventure for such reasons of taste.

For now another element is added to those already considered: namely, the changing relationship between the hero and his companions. That Odysseus cares for his men and feels responsible as a leader for his followers, is another element that does not fit in at all with the old fairy-tale material. In fact, it is something so characteristic of the poet of the *Odyssey,* that this is also not the least criterion by which he is differentiated from the poet of the *Iliad.* In the *Iliad* the men serve no purpose other than to be led, to create the feelings of the crowd and to comprise the waves of battle in attack or flight. Yet the cares of the great heroes are not fixed on them. In the *Odyssey* Odysseus' concern for saving his companions is immediately stressed at the beginning. With each adventure it becomes clearer that they are causing their own destruction through their own fault. For this very reason Odysseus' concern for his men has to grow all the more. This necessitates that the relationship between leader and companions become tense and that in the end a rival leader should put himself forward.

So then again, for the sake of these elements, it is no coincidence that the Circe adventure stands in the middle between the Cyclops adventure and Thrinakia. In the Cyclops adventure Odysseus is still more audacious than concerned, and that is why one could never place it at the end. In the adventure on Thrinakia, Eurylochos becomes mutinous. What breaks out as a result, is prepared for in the Circe adventure. There protest, which eventually leads the crew to destruction, is once again calmed in a friendly say. So this looks, as it were, in both directions. Nowhere else does Odysseus face danger for the others as here. This time the fairy-tale adventure becomes epic because the magic test becomes simultaneously a test of the loyalty between leader and companions. And nowhere else is he rewarded with such heartfelt thanks. The magic fairy tale becomes a tale of the happiest reunion. The heartfelt groans can sound all the stronger this time—"more sentimental" in the reproof of the critics—since soon enough they turn into the opposite, in the sacrilege offered to the cattle of the sun; and Eurylochos, who is humbled one more time, will triumph.

But now what jumping for joy there is! May we detect irony in this?

> And as, in the country, the calves, around the cows returning
> from pasture back to the dung of the farmyard, well filled with grazing,
> come gamboling together to meet them, and the pens no longer
> can hold them in, but lowing incessantly they come running

around their mothers, so these men, once their eyes saw me,
came streaming around me, in tears, and the spirit in them made
them
feel as if they were back in their own country, the very
city of rugged Ithaka, where they were born and raised up.

(10.410–17)

But this means that these men, who are now leaping with joy, will not see Ithaka again. The contrast, which is already being adumbrated here, is the mutiny and the breaking of the oath on Thrinakia:

and Eurylochos put an evil counsel before his companions
"Listen to what I say, my companions, though you are suffering . . ."

(12.339–40)

As a foreshadowing of Thrinakia, this also points back to Polyphemos at the same time. The more Eurylochos refers to the adventure of the Cyclops in his opposition—people have wanted to discard the lines that are indispensible[16]—the more the adventure with Circe must, as it unfolds, become the mirror of the Cyclops adventure. It is for this reason that it begins in the same way; one can see smoke rising and that is enough to cause a general outcry. But there the adventure was very different. After the most terrible losses, after the survivors have barely escaped, Odysseus the daredevil risks all at the end and does not rest until he has drawn the curse of Polyphemos down on himself. Here, after the most terrible beginning, we have a fairy-tale-like happy ending, and not only for Odysseus! Those who are turned back into men become much more handsome than they ever were! The good life enjoyed by all, freshly bathed and dressed, is described with all the conventional epic detail. Yet how the conventional, when contrasted with the pigs' food, does now become unconventional and significant! Heroic elevation at the end of its most terrible opposite. For this contrast we can grasp why the poet used only the pigs instead of the various transforma-

[16] *Od.* 10.435–37 is often rejected as spurious. "Cut out by Kirchhoff; the Cyclops did not shut Odysseus and his companions in his cave so that they could be his watchmen." (E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee*, p. 318). Yet for the man-eater, consuming the companions is no different than casting the spell is for the sorceress. These lines are necessary to explain why Odysseus can be calmed only with difficulty. A hero only reacts in this way when he has been insulted. See *Il.* 1.190 for a model. Odysseus would not snap the head off someone who was merely fearful and warning him. Focke, *Die Odyssee*, p. 254, agrees with Schwartz in also distinguishing two adventure cycles by two different poets. But these references back to the Polyphemos story in the Circe adventure do not rely only on these verses, as has been demonstrated. *Od.* 10.437, in the accusation "for it was by this man's (Odysseus') recklessness that these two perished (in the cave of the Cyclops)," presupposes the opposite: 1.7, "they were destroyed by their own wild recklessness." Therefore the proem, Circe, and Thrinakia are very closely connected. On the other hand, the justification becomes meaningless without at least the appearance of the opposite. Yet how should this impression be created if not in the Polyphemos story? If one makes a serious effort to cut out the Polyphemos story, then one will soon notice that as a result the Circe and Thrinakia adventures also lose their context.

tions into wolves, lions, etc., that the fairy tale offered. The rest of them, a favorite theme in vase painting, are referred to at the beginning and in Eurylochos' speech, yet they are not employed in the story. The pigsty becomes the direct opposite of the description of the heroic banquet.

So that the house of Circe should not lack landscape around it, the stag hunt provides the idyllic element here to balance the island of the goats. Yet the prologue is a heroic idyll in this case, unlike the one before the Cyclops adventure. The stag, on the way to his watering place, falls like a hero in the *Iliad*.[17] At the same time the hunt also reveals Odysseus' concern.

But what is the relationship between the Circe story and the Kalypso episode? Is Kalypso really the original and Circe the copy? Wilamowitz once set himself the task of making the comparison, line by line, to show how the imitator fails, and others up to the most recent time have followed him in this. But here it is a question not only of comparing line by line, but also the different styles and stages.

Circe, the mistress of Aiaia, sister of the treacherous Aietes, reminds us of the magic land in the East, of which Aietes is king, the land to which the Argonauts sailed, later known as Colchis on the east coast of the Black Sea. But the mythical atmosphere suggested by such a genealogy and region is disproportionately stronger, according to the will of the poet, than the geographical connection between the two magic lands, which is still only shadowy. This does not mean that Aiaia is to be equated with Colchis in "Homeric geography" or that it lies in the Northeast; rather it tells us that Odysseus is stepping onto ground where magic and trickery are hereditary.

Sorceresses instead of witches, women like Circe and her niece Medea, are only possible as figures in a world no longer magic. The innumerable parallels with the voyage of Jason or Odysseus in the myths and fairy tales, which are more distant in time, show that magic places of all kinds are all the more intensified and multiplied to an overwhelming extent. Where everything works magic and every step is a spell, there can be no special gods in this field like Hermes or Hekate among the Olympians, nor can there be sorceresses like Medea or Circe. Both have, in turn, differentiated themselves as sorceresses, the one in a terrifying way, the other, Circe, to bring happiness, just as Hekate and Hermes are differentiated as gods. If Medea, as demonically in love and ruining both others and herself, can become a tragic figure, then Circe by contrast becomes a dangerous enchantress, but one who brings luck to a real hero. The Circe adventure is the only one where magic is overcome by a contrary spell. According to its layering this is a very old story, one of those many magic tests, by which the fairy-tale hero must prove himself.[18]

[17] *Od.* 10.163 = *Il.* 16.469. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, p. 121.

[18] For the fairy-tale parallels, cf. the fairy tale by Grimm about Jorinde and Joringel, and the comments by J. Bolte and G. Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm* (vol. 2, Leipzig, 1915), p. 69. See also E. Bethe, *Die Gedichte Homers, Wissen-*

Compared with Circe Kalypso already shows a very well-developed psychology. The fairy tale does not demand this. And yet, if we deny it a psychological element, that does not mean that it misleads us by being unpsychological or psychologically faulty. It only means that one should not measure it in terms of psychology. If Circe becomes charming in an instant after having been a monster, then something psychological is being hinted at, which great epic would hardly accommodate if it were told directly. Equally it would be easy to transcribe the motif of fairy-tale magic into a tone of psychological development, of which no romantic novelist need be ashamed. Why else would Circe be described as so beautiful, so tempting, so seductive, so inviting, triumphing so contemptuously over all the other men, if it were not her foreordained fate to have to do this, until she meets the man whom she recognizes as her master? He is the fortunate and brave man, who does not fall under her spell, like the stupid ones, nor does he run away from her like Eurylochos the coward. Drawing a sword in the style of epic is surely more suitable than swallowing an antidote in the style of fairy tales? The meeting with the god of luck, Hermes, expresses nothing other than that Odysseus is that man. The favor of the gods is only bestowed on people ready to receive it. And now that this finally happens to her, it really is the unconscious goal of all her schemes, which took malicious pleasure in the ruin of others. A miracle happens to her and she is transformed, as if freed from a spell. She immediately invites Odysseus to her bed and becomes a godlike and very loyal mistress.

There is no clash here with the rule of what is psychologically possible, but other things do take the place of psychology. Yet this other element is not only a fairy-tale one; later, novelistic elements are blended in. It is an integral part of this development that a prophecy is fulfilled, that her conquerer was foretold to her, so that instead of putting Odysseus under a spell, she is released from one herself and recognizes her fate in recognizing him. She is released by meeting her match. Stories of this type, which end with the fulfillment of a prophecy, like those known to us from Herodotus, must have been current (cf. the end of the Cyclops and Phaiakian adventures, 9.507 and 13.172!). Yet the fairy-tale elements are shown to be related to the novelistic ones inasmuch as the antidote, which breaks the spell, is already virtually part of the transition and points, by analogy, to a spiritual quality. In the power of the magic, we recognize another, the power of the spirit (10.329):

> There is a mind in you no magic will work on.

Is she making a mistake because she does not recognize the power of *moly* and attributes the gift of the god of magic to Odysseus' "spirit," his *noos*?

So it is only the ending that is not touched by this irridescence, this more-than-fairy-tale quality of the story. The poet certainly knows how to

---

schaft und Bildung, no. 180 (Leipzig, 1922), p. 29. Hermann Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* (Halle, 1921), pp. 95f. Also ibid., pp. 92f., about *moly*.

delight in the contrast between the two Circes, the hostile one and the loving one!

Yet Odysseus represented as the stranger and inquirer testing hospitality of the most varying kinds, does not belong to the ancient fairy-tale tradition; rather he is the invention of our *Odyssey*. When Circe also fulfils her own destiny, which is expressed in the prophecy of which she experiences the fulfillment, fairy tale is turned into poetry. Now that they recognize each other, they are allowed to love each other and Odysseus is allowed to spend a year with her. Indeed he does not resist her magic for so long that we almost begin to fear that he could forget himself and Ithaka. So this adventure ends with a long, drawn-out pause. This is different from the others, which have a sudden climax at the end. The one who usually warns the others, must this time be reminded of himself by the others—which is also an adventure! The Kalypso adventure stands in stark opposition. Circe remains his companion through her advice. The Circe adventure stretches and forms something like a frame around the other stories, like happy forgetfulness before the gloomy revelations of the Underworld. The ordering of the stories creates all these interrelationships. Everything loses its references if one changes this sequence as the philologists have been doing up to most recent times.

Now let us compare Kalypso to Circe. If Circe is the sister of "malicious" Aietes, that is her attribute as a sorceress. Yet Kalypso is also the daughter of a malicious god, "malignant" Atlas (1.52). But how does she show what she has inherited from her father? As is demonstrated at the end, her malice consists only in the mistaken fear of the hero. Circe's malice fills her story. There is no story at all that can be told about Kalypso. What Odysseus has to watch out for with her is described by the same word as what Circe threatens him with: *enchantment* (1.57 ~ 10.213, 291, 318). Yet the tools of "enchantment," for Circe a magic potion and a wand, are for Kalypso only words and the charms of her beauty. The spiritual replaces magic.

> And ever with soft and flattering words she works to
> charm him to forget Ithaka; and yet Odysseus,
> straining to get sight of the very smoke uprising
> from his own country, longs to die.
>
> (1.56–59)

In the case of Circe, her surroundings and the way in which she appears, as one first stands before the gate, then hears her voice, in fact everything around her, relates to her "magic." She sings, tempts, invites, entertains. The characteristic element for her story is the participation she provokes, a participation aimed only at the result of the event. By contrast, at Kalypso's it is the inner situation that demands all participation, no longer needing any outer miracles. The surprise happens in the sphere of the heart, rather than of deeds and wonders. And yet what an assimilation! What insistence on formal elements even in the complete transition from fairy tale almost to

the novel! Kalypso also sings like Circe. Both sing with beautiful voices as they go up and down at the loom. The same line is in both places. Circe's song cannot be cut from her story in that it is a necessary part of the adventure. How lyrically the threefold repetition is dwelt on, first in the fate of the companions, then in the story of Eurylochos running away, and at last confirmed in the experience of Odysseus. Yet we ask, For whom does Kalypso sing? Does she also sing so that a surprised stranger may want to come in, so that he will call to her and she can open the door and invite him in? Odysseus is sitting far away by the sea. Is she singing for Hermes, whom she is not expecting? Or is she singing for herself? She must be. Does what is pretence and malice for Circe become the truth for Kalypso?

The song of Circe cannot be separated from her magic. In the case of Circe also, of course, some of that other magic is added to the old fairy-tale magic, the magic of beauty and figure. She is no longer a witch as in the fairy-tale parallels. But whom is Kalypso singing for? Her song is part of another unity, i.e., the magic of landscape, rocky caves, sweet smells coming from her stove, springs, poplars, and cypresses, birds on the branches. Her song becomes an accompaniment. Instead of a magic fairy tale, we have the magic of an idyll here. This is indeed an enchanting place, before which even a god like Hermes stands still for a while—a picture complete in itself and yet not without connections.

As the god is amazed, Odysseus sits alone by the sea and groans and weeps. One picture contrasts with the other. This is the relationship between immortality, with which the nymph tempts, and the longing for his home, the same as the relationship between love for Kalypso and love for Penelope. For Penelope is present too, although far away, and her presence creates a unity out of everything and introduces a third person where they were only two. A different *Odyssey* would begin with Kalypso without a word about Penelope before her. Would something not be missing in Kalypso's cave if this was the construction? Would it not stop being what it has to be, a complement?

But there are more elements like this in the transformed whole. The god who helps Odysseus escape the spell of both sorceresses is Hermes on both occasions. In the first case he comes as the god of magic, who brings luck on the strength of his own attributes; in the Kalypso adventure he is the stylized messenger of the gods from epic. This may be coincidence. But what adaptation causes Odysseus, in both cases after breaking the spell—i.e., in Kalypso's cave, after she has promised to let him go—to ask for an oath from the goddess.

> to swear me a great oath
> that there is no other evil hurt you devised against me.
>
> (5.178–79 = 10.343–44)

And both are equally willing to do him this favor (again in the same lines). And yet the "evil hurt" that Odysseus is guarding against, is of a very

different nature in each case. The first time he fears the loss of his manly strength—there is reason enough for such a fear if one shares the bed of Circe—the second time he fears something that cannot be described, something threatening in a dark future.[19] Yet when he asks for this oath from Circe, he proves to be foresighted and clever, a master of the situation, the hero of the adventure; but in the other case, when making the same demand, he makes a mistake. But because of this mistake, because he remains the old Odysseus and takes precautions as if Kalypso were a Circe, she loves him all the more. Disdaining the love of a nymph could easily be dangerous. One only has to think of Daphnis. But in this case the sad Kalypso, weeping at being disdained and denied, raging at her fate as she quotes mythical examples, becomes full of loving concern and smiles. The transformation is quieter but for this reason almost more surprising.

Odysseus' care, his demand for an oath from the goddess, is a crucial moment in this new turn (5.180ff):

> So he spoke, and Kalypso, shining among divinities,
> smiled and stroked him with her hand and spoke to him and named him:
> You are so naughty, and you will have your own way in all things.
> See how you have spoken to me and reason with me.

But what can this be except a new variation of the epic scene in which Odysseus is needlessly fearful? This is, more particularly, a different version of his meeting with Athene, when after not recognizing his home, he does not recognize and lies to the goddess who protects him (13.253–86):

> So he spoke. The goddess, gray-eyed Athene, smiled on him,
> and stroked him with her hand, and took on the shape of a woman
> both beautiful and tall, and well versed in glorious handiworks,
> and spoke aloud to him and addressed him in winged words, saying:
> "It would be a sharp one, and a stealthy one, who would ever get past you
> in any contriving; even if it were a god against you.
> You wretch, so devious, never weary of tricks . . ."
>
> (13.288–93)

Which is earlier and which later here? Odysseus as the one who is groundlessly afraid or as the man who is cautious with a reason? There is no

[19] U. v. Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, pp. 119f., tries to prove the independence of the lines around 10.300 or 10.344 (Circe) from the lines at 5.179 (Kalypso), by judging the connection in book 10 to be insufficient. But this only succeeds at the price of an impossible construction. In 5.179 he claims *allo* is in apposition to *pēma kakon moi autōi*. This is supposedly the original construction. In the tenth book *pēma* was changed to an object and *allo* to an attribute. One should just try to read the line in meter in the original form restored by Wilamowitz! Although such appositions floating in the middle of a sentence are at best possible in Aeschylus, they are certainly not so in epic. Also there are no parallels for this. *Allo* does not mean "something different from what you are saying, namely an evil for *me*," but "another new evil." In the tenth book the first evil is what she did to his *companions*. The new evil he fears is what she will do to *him*, to his body, if he does not protect himself. For a similar usage, cf. *Il.* 24.551, 16.262, *Od.* 4.698.

possibility of a doubt. Odysseus can only fear needlessly after the gods want his return, after the council of the gods with which the *Odyssey* begins. In its irony this is part of the poet's plan. The other is a part of the old fairy-tale tradition. The latter cannot be older than the former.

Now let us go back to the question we were asking at the beginning: if, as has turned out, the Kalypso episode as poetry depends on the Circe adventure, and on the form found in our *Odyssey,* is this not an extra reason why it should be by a different poet? I do not want to go through a refutation of this point by point here. At best this would lead to an *Odyssey* that would be like ours but could not be allowed to be the same. Enough of this.

The question here is not what is the original and what an imitation; rather, it is how is the difference qualified as a difference of layers, which the epic uses, as it combines older and newer material, traditions and what is created out of the spirit of the times? Sometimes the epic creates situations from stories, on the model of the *Iliad,* and then digs back again into the traditions of fairy tale. One often becomes the echo of the other. The Kalypso episode is related to the Circe adventure in the same way that Hektor's farewell to Andromache, as an epic situation, is related in material and legend to Hektor's death and the fall of Troy. Or, to keep to the *Odyssey,* in the way the story of Penelope's trick with her weaving is related to her appearance before the deluded suitors, in the epic situation of the eighteenth book. If one wants to look further, then the Gyges fairy tale can also be compared in a similar way to the Herodotean novella. Poetry of this kind forms a transition. In the adventure on Scheria, the fairy-tale element keeps itself hidden under the guise of epic, notwithstanding its contradictions, while here the fairy-tale and the epic elements separate into two figures: Kalypso and, next to her, Circe.[20]

[20] It remains to deal with one objection—also stemming from Wilamowitz. The oath itself is sworn solemnly enough by Kalypso in direct speech:

> Earth be my witness in this, and the wide heaven about us,
> and the dripping water of the Styx, which oath is the biggest
> and most formidable oath among the blessed immortals,
> that this is no other painful trial I am planning against you.
>
> (5.184ff.)

Of Circe Odysseus merely says, "She at once swore me the oath, as I asked her." So is the first not, after all, the model for the second? Yet this oath in these words is only possible if what she swears really does come to pass fully afterward. In the Kalypso adventure the oath is followed by the building of the raft and the whole farewell, so rich in associations. But as a storyteller one cannot have Circe swear an oath of the gods in four lines when nothing happens afterward except, "I mounted the surpassingly beautiful bed of Circe." A preparation must not outweigh what is being prepared for. That this would be the case here is a result in turn of the fitting and molding of the Circe adventure to accommodate the unity of Fate represented by all the adventures together. The objection is overruled by the economy of epic. The oaths in *Iliad* 3.276ff. need not have been sworn so solemnly if a truce and the start of new battles with all their ramifications did not depend on them. [For the relationship between the Gyges fairy tale and Herodotean novella, see K. Reinhardt, *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen, 1960), pp. 139ff.]

The Kalypso adventure ends with the building of the raft. Without the raft there is no Kalypso. Whoever invented Kalypso did his best to thwart any previous hope that could humanly be conceived, that Odysseus would ever come home again. In the fairy-tale tradition, the shipwrecked sailor came to the hospitable Phaiakes. Now he has landed on the furthest island, which is even out of the way for the gods, and in addition he has met a nymph who is in love with him! No more hopeless situation could be imagined. Everyone who longs for something can picture the way the poet of the Telemachy—we assume he is the same person—is concerned in his own sphere to add a hopelessness in Ithaka equal to the one felt out there. These situations are calculated toward unhoped-for solutions. In the fairy-tale traditions it is the helpful spirits who show the fairy-tale heroes a way out. In the world of epic, the spirits also take on another form.

Telemachus is helped by Athene herself, if not through a magic potion, through what is called a miracle in the real world. Yet the nymph does not help Odysseus with a fairy-tale marvel either, no veil or shoes with wings, but she helps him, under orders from Zeus, to make himself a raft with an axe, hatchet, wood, and advice. What a new spirit in an ancient form! The magic help turns into the advice "help yourself!" Odysseus is probably also a master craftsman as inventor of the wooden horse. Here the man, who is rich in designs, enters into a new area, which is dear to the heart of the poet of the *Odyssey:* the spirit of craftsmanship. Why is it that the nymph, in this case, advises him and not Athene? Why does the nymph suddenly have all these tools in her cave of love and bring them to her lover with the diligence of a helpful little elf? This surprising turn of events belongs to the concessions, without which the plan of the *Odyssey* could never have been carried out. But how charming that this is not glossed over but rather explained away, as if to create wonder! How aimless longing turns into beneficial help and how different from Circe!

Naturally Odysseus does not suspect that Zeus has issued the order for building the raft. The surprising part of this reversal, for both father and son, is wrought by the second council of the gods on Olympus, so often undervalued for its ease and superiority. Why then does Hermes not mention the raft in his instructions to Kalypso? Why does Kalypso anticipate him (5.140f.)? Perhaps because otherwise the invention would lose some of its charm. If one thinks about the instructions to build a raft—it is better after all the way it is written.

THRINAKIA

Why must the adventures that come after Circe be prophesied by her? Why does the poet dispense with the surprises that the stories offer? If they are unannounced, they bear witness to the ever new presence of mind of the

hero in situations that are constantly more difficult. They were, after all, devised simply for this effect. The stories about Sinbad are no different. It may be said that we now reach a different excitement instead of the initial one, an excitement aimed at how, exactly, prophecies are actually fulfilled. What has been foretold, when it happens, is something different from the unexpected. Prophecy turns the dangers into a fate that has been imposed. The hero who must survive them becomes less inventive, but in return he becomes more of a "sufferer." How this is connected to the plan of the whole *Odyssey* has already been partially revealed to us. Yet one thing still needs to be added here.

Among these adventures there is one to which prophecy has not been added later, one that could not be told at all without prophecy and warning. This one has evidently pulled the other stories along with it as well. Prophecy opens up two possibilities, the "either-or" of foretelling, which has nothing to do otherwise with the nature of the danger, such as, for example, the clashing rocks, the Rovers, about which it is foretold, "Either you must go through them or past Skylla and Charybdis." In one case this either-or cannot be separated from the whole meaning of the adventure, because it becomes a test, a *peira* sent by the gods, a question of passing or failing a test, but in a much more moral rather than a fairy-tale sense. For this very reason the story of the sacrilege done to the cattle of the sun is essentially different from all the others. Precisely because of it the poet decided on the constrictions of this format.

He places a unique and particular stress on this adventure. Not only the prologue points to this (1.8) but also the nineteenth book (275), when the explanation for the shipwreck points back to this by mentioning only this one adventure instead of the rest. Although it is positioned like a fairy-tale adventure among other fairy-tale adventures, as if framed by Skylla and Charybdis, yet in its nature it is something different, no Sinbad story. According to its inner format, it is something legendary, that is to say, something religious. It is a warning, a first step into misfortune, which they do not sail past. First we have the promise backed up by an oath, then the test, the temptation through hunger, through the constant adverse winds, the complaining, the triumph of evil, the evil premonitions at the sacrifice . . .

All this is much more reminiscent of cult-legends than of any fairy-tale element. Such legends tell about the punishment of some kind of sacrilege against the god's possessions, the temple's goods, sacred groves, hearths, or the like.[21] According to an old temple legend, Zeus puts Tantalos to the test, because he is keeping something he has stolen from the temple, the dog from Zeus' sanctuary on Crete. As a warning he asks him about it through Hermes (scholion on Pindar, *Olympian* 1.91). The punishment of Erysichthon, when he fells Demeter's sacred grove in order to build himself

[21] Radermacher also categorizes the Thrinakia adventure as a legend from the point of view of a general comparison of motifs. We are concerned with the Greek, literary elements.

a banqueting hall, is also introduced by a warning. The goddess, in the disguise of the priestess, warns him, as is narrated by Callimachus in the style of a legend. The poet of the *Odyssey,* as if it were a question of the same kind of thing, warns Aigisthos, who surely would not have deserved on his own account that Zeus should bother about him and send Hermes to enlighten him (1.35ff). Similarly, the following elements are clearly all part of a religious form. A person announces the sacrilege to the god who has been injured, the anger of the god follows and his threat not to carry out his function in the future, if he is not given his due, and then Zeus' guarantee of his rights. Just as here the Heliad Lampetion reports to Helios what has happened, so the raven reports the faithlessness of Koronis to Apollo in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (scholion on Pindar, *Pythian* 3.48). Similarly Helios tells Hephaistos about Aphrodite's adultery in *Odyssey* 8.270. In all three cases the same formula is repeated. Helios' threat not to shine on the earth anymore is equivalent to Demeter's refusal in the Homeric hymn to let sown corn grow. In both cases it is Zeus who affords reparation to the insulted divinity.

If Odysseus the narrator knows about such things but has to rely on information from Kalypso to make this knowledge believable, then the boundaries of style are being crossed, because Odysseus not only knows about something he has not found out for himself; he knows something that is quite beyond human experience. Yet this is indispensable to the meaning of the adventure, but only this particular adventure, an adventure different from all the others.

Sleep overcomes the hero. Outwardly considered, this is the same as the Aiolos adventure. Here he goes across the island to pray, there he is not alert at the helm. So the sleep seems "unmotivated." It overcomes him like a seeming release as he prays, a refreshing sleep. This is part of the plan, laid down in the prophecy; the companions must be responsible for themselves in order to be tested. If they pass the test, they will see their home again; if not, they will perish.

Just as necessary as the warning here, is also the punishment, specifically a punishment brought about by Zeus. This can only be a storm with lightning. But a storm that is neither miraculous nor a Sinbad adventure, but purely and simply a storm is not part of the tradition or fairy tale, but rather a poetic invention. The part played by the poet seems much greater in this adventure than in any other one. Despite the borrowings from the *Iliad* (12.385, 16.742), the storm is composed nicely enough. But it has only enough weight as poetic invention to counterbalance what has come before, that is to say, as a moral and poetic sequel.

What is left over if one looks beyond the threads that tie this adventure to the whole? What if the mutiny, the spokesman Eurylochos, the sacrilege of the sacrifice, etc.—what if all this is not there on its own account but is all required by the plan of the *Odyssey*? All that is left is the name three-Promontory Island, which is a puzzle, and the delay and hunger caused by

contrary winds (although this happened in Aulis before they set out and again on Pharos). And in the end there are the cattle sacred to Helios. But cattle, which are sacred to Helios, existed for cult also at Tainaron (according to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 411–13), at Gortyn on Crete (Servius on Virgil's *Eclogues* 6.60), and equally at Apollonia in Epirus, as attested by legend. Herodotus 9.93 tells how carefully they were cared for and how the herdsman once paid a penalty for failing in his duty. The same can be found in legend. On Chalkidike Heracles killed the giant Alkyoneus, who possessed the "cattle of Helios" and had probably stolen them (scholion to Pindar, *Isthmian* 4.47).[22]

The adventure on Thrinakia may have developed from such a kernel of saga; or else the widely spread legend about the stars, according to which the children of the sun were killed, may lie behind it. Whatever it may be, as was noted before, the actual origin here lies in a formal element, in the influence of legend.

The dependence on religious forms in a part of the poem which stands out so clearly from the rest is characteristic of the poet of the *Odyssey*. The poet of the *Iliad* composes in a different way. But if the adventure on Thrinakia cannot be told at all without a warning, where should we get the person who is to warn? This question is all the more complicated because the connection with the Circe adventure or with Teiresias is obviously secondary, that is to say, is no earlier than the work of this poet. There is no answer to this question. The religious element only shows itself more clearly in connection with the whole. If the companions on Thrinakia are warned, if even Aigisthos is warned, that is all the more reason for introducing the final revenge on the Suitors with a warning, if it is to be a judgment! For this reason the poet of the *Odyssey* has interwoven the life of the seer Theoklymenos with the Telemachy, and with this a part of the seer's world enters into the poetry. The religious coloring, which the deed of vengeance takes on, can be seen in the miracle of the double face, and when the meal turns into blood and laughter becomes wailing (20.350). This is in the same spirit as the signs at the sacrifice on Thrinakia (12.394), when the meat begins to bellow and the skin to creep. This spirit is not at home in fairy tales or the heroism of the *Iliad;* it is a new addition.

CHARYBDIS

If the very different story of the cattle of the sun stands between Skylla and Charybdis in the middle of the fairy-tale double adventure, as if framed by these two, and if this arrangement were the work of this poet, then one question can no longer be avoided. What did this section look like as a double adventure, before the Thrinakia adventure was introduced in be-

[22] Cf. Kranz, "Die Irrfahrten des Odysseus," pp. 93f.

tween? Odysseus first sails past the jaws of Charybdis to Thrinakia only to be brought back again by the storm. Now after his ship has been wrecked, saved by the mast and keel, he must still survive this most terrible of all adventures, Charybdis. This version, with its climax and with epic retardation introduced, cannot have been handed down, but rather it is composed according to a poetic plan. And so do we see ourselves in the end once more facing one of those tasks that we were trying to avoid, the task of making a reconstruction? This is not the reconstruction of a poem but of a tradition.

If Odysseus went from Skylla to Charybdis as if from the frying pan into the fire, how did the story go on? In that case he was not caught in the whirlpool riding on his plank but with his whole ship still intact. Then Skylla was only the beginning. In the fairy tale the sea's jaws swallowed something that was worth swallowing, not just a measly plank but a whole ship at once. Only Odysseus, who was high on the deck and not swimming and half under water, caught hold of the overhanging fig tree. He hung there until Charybdis stopped sucking in and started to spit out. Instead of the ship, only bodies and wrecked fragments reappeared. Then he let himself fall on the mast and so, shipwrecked, he reached not the island of Kalypso, as in the *Odyssey,* but the Phaiakes, those spirits of the sea who save from all perils at sea.

This sequence has left a trace in the extant poem. We are not told how Odysseus drifted to the island of Kalypso, what happened there, and how she "saved" him. The more fruitful the epic situation of Odysseus missing and presumed dead by the world, hidden for seven years already by his "savior," the less it needs the narrative of a special journey to explain it. Kalypso is pure circumstance. A narrative in the same style of how Odysseus got to her could only have produced a doublet of his landing in the land of the Phaiakes.

On the other hand it is noticeable that in the advice of Circe the fig tree, which hangs over Charybdis, is mentioned, but there is no word of explanation about what purpose it should serve. The adventure demanded presence of mind on the part of the hero. So the fig tree was there for no other reason than for the hero to hold onto it. The whirlpool of Charybdis could not be there for any other reason than to swallow the ship and crew. From this it follows that the same poet, who made Circe into an advisor by transferring to her the role of someone who helps in need, separated Charybdis from Skylla and introduced the Thrinakia adventure between the two. It is evident that those two told together would follow each other in the logic of the fairy tale. But it is also clear why the poet made these changes. For if the story were told in its original version, then the companions would not perish "as a result of their own sin." Then Odysseus would not try to "save" them right up to the last minute, by word and deed, as their hero and advisor. So as a fairy-tale hero he was not the same man who ruled "mild like a father" when he was at home. Originally then there was no action in

the sphere of the gods to parallel human destruction, but rather their ruin was a meaningless horror.

What this poet has added is retardation and variety, a mixture of fairy-tale and moral elements, dark foreshadowing of the future, thunder in the air and sudden lightning strikes. In a word, epic was introduced into his fairy-tale plot only by that restructuring. But who would care to reconstruct an older poem out of it now?

NEKYIA

The more the world of the dead refers to and connects the past and future of Odysseus, his ways and means to get home and at the same time, in a wider sense, his final goal beyond any home, it becomes the most otherworldly of all adventures and at the same time the most immediate. As a complete picture of fate both near and distant, surpassing all the other adventures in its scope, its style and content have much more in common with the great heroic epic than with fairy-tale tradition. There were and still are philologists who see in it a freely invented intermezzo, added by a more recent poet. On the other hand the Underworld appears as the goal of the magic journeys, as in mythical fairy tales from all places, not least because of the shamans at work behind the scenes here.[23] Be that as it may, the difficulty remains, which cannot be properly understood, as to what task Odysseus is supposed to accomplish among the dead. What the *Odyssey* tells us here about questioning Teiresias and burying Elpenor is not traditional but newly composed, not a story in itself but links between other stories.

Adventures and fairy tales about labors are generally distinct forms with little in common. It would be easy to invent an Underworld adventure for Odysseus in the style of his meeting with the Lotus Eaters or Sirens. For example: he drifted into ever more distant seas, until he reached the gates of the Underworld. Curiosity tempted him to enter and then he was almost caught by the dead. Persephone sent the head of the Gorgon up against him. He barely escaped. One of his companions, who looked back, was frozen where he stood. But that would be arbitrary. In any case, in the *Odyssey* the Underworld is the only one of all the adventures that turned into a kind of labor. Although he does not have to bring up the hound of hell, no other way leads home except through the dead. To visit the dead means to survive the impossible. It is no wonder that the hero loses his courage. Circe takes over the role of the helpful spirit here. Initially we must be satisfied with the conclusion that the poem is based here on the abstract and spiritualized *form* of a fairy story, but not the *content* of one.

The journey to the other world has some elements of a magic journey. Odysseus in his depressed state asks who will show him the way if he must travel to the dead. The sorceress answers that he should entrust himself to

[23] Cf. K. Meuli, "Scythica," *Hermes* 70 (1935), p. 168.

the North wind. Who steers? Is it she herself? Is this his predestined fate? What power leads him back to her again, like one risen from the dead? Even more mysterious is the instruction to question Teiresias. In the *Odyssey* there is hardly another figure who has less to do with Odysseus, and yet the whole of the rest of his fate is said to depend on him. How does the blind seer come to take on such significance? What connects the Theban with the man from Ithaka? Is this person from a completely different sequence of legends not being inserted into this one in a highly arbitrary manner? And is it not a contradiction in itself that Odysseus should have asked Teiresias about his way home but Teiresias revealed something quite different to him: that is to say, the consequences of his adventures on Thrinakia, the loss of his companions, his victory over the Suitors, and the end of his life? One element squeezes out the other one. The purpose of the journey for Odysseus disappears behind the purpose of the poet. Our view of the whole created by the connections glides superficially, without stopping long, over the interwoven motifs, which seem to surface only to disappear again immediately.

The Nekyia and Proteus Adventure

If one is looking for parallels, then the nearest one in the *Odyssey* is the Proteus adventure. Proteus prophesying in the Telemachy is related to Teiresias prophesying in the Nekyia, as the journeys of Menelaos parallel those of Odysseus. Proteus is not as serious as Teresias, just as the fate of Menelaos is not as burdensome as that of Odysseus. Yet both Proteus and Teiresias are questioned because they are the only source of information about the way home. Both are asked the same question in the same way, both prophesy beyond to the death of the questioner, both foretell a very happy ending, and both therefore make an effective exit. The question about the way leads into the distance, the same turn of fate in both cases, the same form of first-person narrative. If it were firmly established that the Telemachy was the work of a more recent poet, then the Proteus adventure would have to be modeled on the journey to the Underworld. The question as to their relationship becomes a question about the number of poets.

In the Proteus adventure people saw the attempt of the more recent poet to rival the adventures of the older one. Can this view be maintained? The starting point for a comparison in such cases is usually to ask in which places and in which contexts repeated lines clearly keep their original meaning.

The question is posed in the same words by Circe and Eidothea (4.389f. = 10.539f.):

> *He* could tell you the way to go, the stages of your journey,
> and tell you how to make your way home on the sea where the fishes swarm.

In the *Telemachy* these lines stand like a refrain in a narrative that moves forward evenly in stanzas, as it were. On the island of Pharos, a day's journey from the mouth of the Nile, Menelaos is detained by adverse winds. The daughter of the old man of the sea becomes his helper. First he asks *her* whether *she* knows what is holding him back,

> which one of the immortals hampers me here and keeps me from my journey;
> and tell me how to make my way home on the sea where the fish swarm.
>
> (4.380–81)

She refers him to the old man:

> If somehow you could lie in ambush and catch hold of him,
> *he* could tell you the way to go, the stages of your journey,
> and tell you how to make your way home on the sea where the fishes swarm.
>
> (4.388–90)

According to epic custom the same question is repeated to Proteus under duress, and he answers that Menelaos must turn round and go back to the mouth of the Nile first, to offer a hecatomb to the gods; only then will he be able to get out into the open sea.

Here the wanderer is, in fact, shown the way. The motif hardly mentioned in the Nekyia and then given up again, leads on here from daughter to father, as he alone knows the way. And yet what is Proteus like, as a figure of prophecy, compared with the shadowy seer of quite different powers! In the fourth book he is the character who overshadows everything else.[24] Teiresias in the Nekyia is like a makeshift resource by comparison. He prophesies and leaves, as the mass of meetings jostle on past him. Proteus remains in the character of the prophet throughout the adventure. He is the center holding together the outermost elements. Through him, the daemon of the sea, the fate of the other men traveling home is revealed: the storm in which Locrian Ajax is wrecked; the disastrous voyage of Agamemnon, who barely manages to land; and also the darkness around Odysseus. He himself, Proteus, saw him with Kalypso! Through him, for the first time, the return

[24]That the information about the journey must be obtained forcibly by overpowering a daemon is one of the more common themes that repeat themselves in fairy tales about labors. In order to find out the way in his search for the apples of the Hesperides, Heracles wrestles with the old man of the sea Nereus, who keeps changing his shape. Perseus discovers his way from the Graiae, whom he tricks. Phineas prophesies the way to the Golden Fleece for the Argonauts. Cf. Meuli, *Odyssee und Argonautika*, p. 102. For the motif of the neglected hecatomb, cf. *Il.* 7.450. Consider from the point of view of the history of form, the increasing popularity of the adventures of the old man of the sea since the seventh century; cf. Ernst Buschor, *Meermänner, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Phil.-hist. Abteilung, 1941, vol. 2, part 1. The questioning of spirits in the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh has a different meaning.

of Odysseus is revealed as a fate connected to that of others, with a place in the whole pattern.[25] What a climax such a surprise is for the Telemachy that began so gently and socially!

Although Egypt is not part of that distant world through which Odysseus is wandering and cannot be compared with it, yet suddenly the sea, the smell of salt, seal hunting, and the world of wonders combine into the magic of an adventure-filled, distant land! This is not one of those wrestling matches that Peleus had to endure with Thetis or Heracles with Nereus or Triton with his fish's body. Instead, the center of this adventure is the meeting with the daemon in the realistically described surroundings of his element. This fight is not in the naive style of the old mythical fairy tales; rather the adventurous element in the world of wonders, the element of grace in the monstrous, is relished as a contrast, and through this the narrative gains its charm. This beach scene serves as a complement to the pastoral episode in the cave of the Cyclops.

Early in the morning, after preparing himself with prayer, Menelaos takes his three best men to the beach with him, where Eidothea is already waiting for them with four fresh seal skins. Quickly she digs four trenches in the sand in which to hide the hunters. For the hunt can only succeed if it relies on the seal-like habits of the old man. At noon he appears on the beach, rallies his seals, and last of all himself lies down in the middle of his females and goes to sleep, like a shepherd in the middle of his flock. He counts the disguised men as the first seals. As far as knowledge of the animal world goes, one could quote whole pages out of Brehm's *Tierleben* for comparison.[26]

[25] For the perspective of the arrangement of the *nostoi* around the *nostos* of Odysseus, cf. Friedrich Klingner, *Über die vier ersten Bücher der Odyssee Sitzuhgsberichte der Sachsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Phil.-hist. Klasse, vol. 96, 1944, p. 51.

[26] "All the seals are sociable to a high degree. The more remote the region, the more numerous their herds and families. The less man has contact with them, the more comfortable and even genial these creatures, which are extremely shy in more settled regions, tend to become. The lifestyle of the seals is nocturnal. They like to spend the day on land sleeping and sunning themselves. They object strongly to any disturbance of their comfortable situation. Many species hardly let themselves be chased away. With pleasure they stretch and roll over on their resting places. They offer first their backs, then their sides and soon their bellies to the friendly rays of the sun. Every seal group is a family. The male always couples with several females, and many of these sultans of the sea possess a harem of thirty to forty slaves. After every harem is full, the males roam complacently back and forth contemplating their family. . . . We decided to watch these animals, and for this purpose dug a hole in the sand. Our boat had hardly sailed some five hundred paces off when the whole group of seals appeared in the water nearby, listening with curiosity and apparent satisfaction to us imitating their sounds. They raised their bodies half out of the water, and in this remarkable position came closer and closer to the island's shore. When we then imitated the higher, weaker sounds usually emitted by the males, the much larger females were the first to crawl out of the water and soon approached our dugout, following the seductive sounds, although they could certainly see our heads sticking out. *Brehms Tierleben: Allgemeine kunde des Tierreichs,*[4] ed. O. zur Strassen, vol. 11 [Leipzig and Vienna, 1914], pp. 580–88 . . . 595, 605.

Yet we find quite original touches amid the fairy-tale elements. The helper in need, betrayer of her own father, unlike Medea or Ariadne or the numerous others, saves her hero from the tortures of a stench rather than from dangers! Do this long lying in the heat and the realistic elements of the hunt come as a new adventure before the old? How charming Eidothea is as a helper when compared with Leukothea! Instead of helping with a veil or another spell, she uses ambrosia. This fits in with the changed character of both the adventure and the hero. Kalypso keeps this back from Odysseus because he scorns immortality. But Eidothea at any rate puts a few drops under the nose of her chosen one.

In comparison with this, the questioning of Teiresias remains very undeveloped, weak, and shadowy. The motifs are the same but they are not firmly rooted in their context in the same way. If one is the model for the other here, then the Nekyia is modeled on the Telemachy, not vice versa.[27]

The Nekyia and the Circe Adventure

And yet the Nekyia is the more significant episode when compared with the Proteus adventure. If it seems to pale in comparison with other poems about the Underworld, in comparison with Virgil and Dante, then we are not noticing what makes it different and how it stands out. Certainly its significance does not lie in the grandiose or fantastic. There is more of this in the few lines of the *Iliad* 20.61ff., when Hades jumps up from his throne and is afraid that his kingdom is about to be split open, than in the whole Nekyia. This poet is not concerned with primeval forces or elements, nor with mythical powers and their conflicts. Instead he describes some landscape even in front of the Underworld and he places a sacred grove there

[27] In the Proteus adventure and the journey to the underworld, we find a second group of identical lines, in which Menelaus despairs at the news of Agamemnon's death in the same way as does Odysseus when he learns he has to go to the dead: 4.538–41 and 10.496–99. Both sit and weep, their hearts no longer wish to live, but when each has wept and rolled around on the ground sufficiently . . . The only difference is that this takes place in the one case "on the shore," in the other "on the couch," that is, Circe's. The dependence of the tenth book on the fourth has been noted by A. Kirchhoff, *Die homerische Odyssee*[2], (Berlin, 1879), p. 223; the reverse by von der Mühll, "*Odyssee,*" Pauly-Wissowa, and Focke, *Die Odyssee*, p. 201. Kirchhoff is probably right. At the height of his pain, the Homeric man "rolls" on the ground, in filth (*Il.* 24.165); "to sit on the shore" signifies to think no longer of journeys (*Il.* 24.403). Odysseus' companions, when they hear they must go to the underworld, "sit down and tear their hair with lamentation" (*Od.* 10.567). The continuity in the fourth book is also more comprehensive and convincing. Proteus prophesies in the manner of a seer what awaits them at 4.494, which causes an outburst of excessive grief. The prophet must wait until he can point to a quick voyage home. The curve of the emotion is like that in 10.568. In the other case it is the questioner, Odysseus himself, who after his despair passes pulls himself together for new questions. The antitheses between the first and second person are more precise in the fourth book (my <heart> failed . . . but he . . ."). The conclusion is that whoever leaves the Nekyia as it is, as the work of the "first poet," cannot ascribe the Telemachy to a "second poet."

(10.509). Yet he also avoids the ghostly elements of folklore, the hound of hell, the gate of Hades, and such things. At the end even Gorgo is only a fear, without ever actually appearing. Heracles' journey to Hades, which is assumed to have been well-known and is even quoted, would have been quite different. So the emphasis falls all the more on the human encounters, and the surprises in question and answer. As the longest of all the adventures, the Nekyia is, at the same time, the most spiritual, as life measures itself against death and death against life. They cannot grasp each other, either physically or spiritually, but that only makes them all the more strongly drawn to one another. A tone that is new in relation not only to the fear of Hades but also to all the other adventures prevails over primitive beliefs about death. This new tone is sustained and arresting like the tone of an elegy. The hero falls under a completely new spell here. The Nekyia is the most distant of all the adventures not only in an outward sense but, at the same time, as the ultimate opportunity for human experience. For this very reason it is surrounded by all the others, and it overshadows the wonders of fairy tale. The fact that Odysseus sets out and returns home, a man for whom hope was given up but who was saved, shows that he has crossed not only the boundaries of the real world of epic, but also those of fairy tale.

There has been no shortage of attempts to separate this second journey from the Circe adventure on the grounds that it is an "interpolation." Yet these efforts merely reveal how close the connection between the two is. The same poet who designed the Circe adventure in this way must have had the Nekyia follow it. Without the latter, the former would not serve as contrast. The adventure ends abruptly with a dichotomy between external and internal elements, which is strange enough. After a year of delaying, Odysseus, on what is to be his last night of love with her, asks the goddess to send him on his way, because he has been admonished by his companions.

After they have enjoyed their pleasure, she reveals to him that he can leave if he wishes to but that he should know that he will not reach home unless he travels by way of the dead. At this Odysseus groans and moans. His despair is expressed in the same words as those used by Menelaos when Proteus reveals Agamemnon's death. These words are more in their original setting there than here, but here the contrast of life and death, horror and pleasure, forgetting and being reminded is much more "adventurous." He goes from the nights of love with the goddess into the ghostliness of the shadows and very different embraces. The road to the Underworld leads from Circe not because of some mythical geography but because in the rhythm of adventure, pleasure and death, forgetting and remembering, losing oneself with the goddess and finding oneself with the dead, all require each other as contrasts, and must follow on one another with such abrupt transitions. The change is so disconcerting that we do not ask why for long. "Who will show me the way there?" "Leave that to the winds!" The connection with the whole goes beyond the motivation for the individual parts.

How rough is the awakening of his companions, so innocent in their moralizing! On the day before, they were still urging Odysseus to think of his home, as he hesitated, but how desperate they are the next morning once they have what they wanted! How upset the same men are who were still so victorious the day before! Yet what would happen to all this if instead of the above Circe's answer were, "Go if you want, but you should know that first you must go to—the Sirens!" Philologists before whose criticisms the Underworld adventure did not stand up, have not hesitated to invent this in order to restore the original here.[28]

TEIRESIAS

Teiresias, however, remains a shadow compared with Proteus. And yet he was chosen as a character according to the very different content of his prophecy. Although the question is posed in the same words, here the issue is not the journey back home in the outward sense of the Proteus prophecy. The answer no longer corresponds to the question. The way to be shown has become an inner way—no longer the way over the seas but through the cliffs and dangers of one man's fate. Teiresias steps into the life of Odysseus as a figure from the Oedipus cycle or the *Thebaid,* as the prophet of tragic relationships, as one who warns of the wrath of the gods. Proteus was the right person to prophesy about the winds and the journey. How does this concern the blind seer? He knows about guilt and atonement, curse and blessing. He uncovers the wrath of Poseidon, as he once revealed the wrath of the gods toward Oedipus. He is the one appointed to predict a dark, looming future, a disastrous fate a man tends to fall into, the more he would like to escape it. If one takes away the prediction of impending doom from his prophecy, one also takes away, at the same time, its relation to the prophet.

Teiresias' speech is one of the most criticized parts of the whole *Odyssey,* a fact that does have some significance. As this part seemed to be crumbling, scholars demolished it only to erect more imposing hypotheses on its ruins. Their claim is that the main section, the prophecy of a death "far from the sea," is taken from another epic, the *Thesprotis,* by the second (or third) poet

[28] U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, p. 144: "The instructions for the journey to Hades have taken the place of the instructions for the adventures of the twelfth book. After 10.489 came the transitional thought, "'Certainly you must sail tomorrow, but that will lead you into new dangers,'" 12.38–142. Again in *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, p. 79, he says, "If Odysseus summons up the soul of Teiresias because he is to undertake more journeys after returning home, then the whole Nekyia has been inserted into the apologue by someone who wanted to tack on the *Thesprotis*." Similarly Erich Bethe, *Homer* II (Leipzig and Berlin, 1922), pp. 136f.: "He (the man revising the poem) fitted the Nekyia carefully into the poem at its beginning and end. He did this by using Circe's advice 10.490 and the return to her 12.1 as well as the Elpenor episode." Erwin Rohde, *Kleine Schriften II* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901), p. 268, also does not doubt this interpolation.

who reworked the *Odyssey,* and that it only makes sense coming from this source. This epic supposedly told the story of Odysseus' wanderings overland to Thesprotia, during which this prophecy was fulfilled. Odysseus had not summoned the ghost of the Theban seer from the Underworld at the end of the world but at his own home, before he set out on his new wanderings. He is said to have told this story himself, although not for the Phaiakes but for Penelope when he was once again taking leave of her.[29]

This is surely one of the most ingenious attempts to deduce the source from a poem itself. Let us examine what we have here.

The seer begins in an ironical tone: 'If the return home, which you seek, seems sweet as honey to you, a god will make it terrible for you!' In the next sentence the equivalent comes in the expression "I think," which does not express a doubt but certainty. "I think Poseidon will not, after all, forget his anger about the blinding of his son." Here Odysseus does not hear something, for the first time, that he could not know; rather he learns of something that he should have guessed. Seers are in the habit of calling on their knowledge of the past in order to give proof of their knowledge of the future. Something like this ought to follow now: "rather, you will have enough to suffer." Instead the conclusion is drawn into the new beginning. "Despite all the sufferings you will undergo, you would still reach home—*if* greed does not seduce you to violate the cattle of the sun." This warning against transgression is the goal of the opening remarks, "Take care, or else. . . ." This element of "either/or," the decision on which everything else

[29] E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee*, p. 134f.; Von der Mühll, *"Odyssee"* ([=*Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, pp. 64–66), and "Die Dichter der *Odyssee*," p. 92. (=*Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, p. 135). The so-called *Thesprotis* was supposed to have contained an account of how Odysseus, after coming home, set out on foot to perform the sacrifice to Poseidon required of him. On his way he won the heart of the queen of the Thesprotians and, as her husband, made war on the Thracian king (which, among other things, is listed as part of the *Telegony* in Proclus' *Chrestomathia* and Apollodorus' epitomy). Apart from all these things, a story that is not attested anywhere, before he set out again Odysseus conjured up the shade of Teiresias from the Underworld somewhere and obtained this oracle. With this information he directly bade forewell to Penelope and in the end he passed away, fulfilling the oracle by dying a blessed death as king of the Thesprotians. Instead of having to wander, Odysseus would ask, "Shall I go on wandering?" Meeting Teiresias would no longer be an adventure when removed from his whole marvelous context. But this means he would have nothing more to do with the character of Odysseus. To address the questions raised by Schwartz, people balk at insects in the *Odyssey* only to accept elephants in reconstructed epics. Among the explanations for this, we hear the following: oracles of this kind were usually attributed to founders. But does Odysseus become a founder in the *Telegony*? According to Proclus and Apollodorus, he wins the love of a queen along the way, after whose death he returns home and fulfills the oracle at home after his return. A trace of the original is said to be the first person plural of the possessive pronoun at 11.33, as if the first person plural did not serve to describe everything connected with home. "Our sheep" is supposed to be addressed to Penelope. "To you" in 11.134 stands as a contrast to the destruction of the Suitors, which is left out at 23.281. The Eurytanes of Epirus have an oracle about Odysseus: Lykophron 799 with the scholia. Similarly Odysseus appears in countless local legends as the founder of altars, etc. But there also I see no connection with Teiresias' prophecy, since it is Teiresias who prophesies and not Odysseus.

depends, is stressed with every technique and all the power of parallel sentence construction. When repeated in the instructions of Circe (12.137), the warning is less extensive but the characteristics of the magic island are more stressed. Such shades of meaning are part of the style of epic.

The future that has been promised, has conditions attached to it and more of these are added. "Yet if you do reach home, it will be late, without companions, and on a strange ship." People felt that this prophecy was impossible. As if there were not enough prophecies and oracles that are so conditional! For comparison one can cite Calchas' prophecy at the beginning of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon,* Darius' prophecy in Aeschylus' *Persae,* Teiresias' prophecy in Sophocles' *Antigone,* oracles such as those in *Trachiniae,* etc. The warning seems even more urgent, the more inevitably the prophecy will be fulfilled. There is no inconsistency between prophecy and warning. What follows is all a part of this. The "misfortune" Odysseus will find at home is contrasted with the "honey sweet return" he is promising himself.

The more the future is fixed, the more prophetic the speech becomes. And yet part of it overlaps word for word with the curse of Polyphemos (11.114f. = 9.534f.). Are the two lines about the late return and the misfortune at home taken from there? Have they been inserted clumsily, as has been claimed? One can just as easily claim the opposite. One thing is sure: they are dependent on each other. The words for "returning home" instead of "coming," for "arriving" instead of "finding" are more precise in the eleventh book than in the ninth. A prophecy may have limitations, but hardly a curse. The curse of Polyphemos also uses this prophetic format. That the blinded Cyclops believes he can hurt his mortal enemy most of all through the death of all his companions is less evident than when Odysseus hears these very words from the mouth of the seer, instead of the "honey sweet homecoming" he had been hoping for. Finally, the end of the prayer in book 9 asks that the trouble with the Suitors should also befall Odysseus because of Poseidon. This is not mentioned except in the curse of Polyphemos and is unthinkable.

Therefore Teiresias' speech is not a thoughtless repetition, but rather the curse of Polyphemos and the speech of Teiresias refer to each other. Just as the Nekyia holds together the different strands, layers, and locations of the *Odyssey* in a unity, so an additional connection is made, by Teiresias' prophecy, between the Cyclops, Thrinakia, and the killing of the Suitors. A thread is spun that runs through to the end and even beyond the end of the poem. Blindness, misunderstanding, revelation through a seer, warning, atonement and promise—the connection between all these integrated moments is not to be found only in Teiresias' speech. The arrangement of the adventures points to this.

The speech of the seer is above all *religious* both in the form and content. It is as religious in forms as only the adventure on Thrinakia. Guilt and atonement point to each other. Why would the seer start with the wrath of the god, if he did not know a way to appease the divinity? Proteus was

simply a teller of fortunes, his words were unambiguous. The speech of Teiresias ends in the style of an oracle. Mystery, or *griphos*, is of the essence for an oracle. His advice is that after the murder of the Suitors Odysseus should shoulder an oar and journey inland until someone asks him what kind of a "winnowing-fan" he is carrying. There he should plant the oar in the ground and sacrifice a ram, a bull, and a boar to Poseidon. After coming home he should offer a hecatomb to every Olympian god and then he would die a gentle death at a great old age, far from the sea, in the middle of his happy people.

"Winnowing-fan" instead of winnowing shovel is a rare word, artifically sinister, a paraphrase, which is popular in the language of oracles. An example is Aristotle, Frag. 561 (in V. Rose, *Aristotelis Fragmenta,* 3rd ed. [Leipzig, 1886]) (Plutarch, *Quaestiones Graecae* 15). The Opuntian Kabyes is instructed by the Delphic oracle to found a colony where he is bitten by a wooden dog. He travels into the country of the Ozolian Locrians and there he steps on a rosehip bush, called "dogrose" in Greek. As he is resting for a few days as a result of his injury, he understands the oracle and recognizes the "dogrose" as the "wooden dog." Similarly the "winnowing-fan" is wordplay for a "winnowing shovel." When asked about his "winnowing shovel," Odysseus is supposed to remember that mysterious "winnowing fan" and recognize the fulfilment of the prophecy.[30]

A prophecy of death, especially for a hero who returns to this world as the only one living through so many brushes with death, is hardly to be missed, if only for its biographical significance in a poem so concerned with any biographical detail. Such a prophecy is not lacking in the wanderings of Menelaos. If the death of the hero himself were missing in the great parade of the dead in the Nekyia, then the connecting element would be missing in the fates of all the others—Agamemon, Ajax, and Achilleus. An added factor is that, since the *Iliad,* the prediction of death counts as one of the means of incorporating the whole life of a hero in a few days, by using references to

[30] Anatole France wrote a charming and learned little piece about the winnowing shovel in *Le Génie latin.* Some of the meaning of the puzzle seems to have been revealed to English sailors. I found the following in Irene Seligo's *Zwischen Traum und Tat* (Frankfurt, 1938), p. 208:

> The story goes that once an English sailor became thoroughly sick at heart with the dangers and insecurities of his profession. When he returned to his home port, he shouldered an oar and traveled inland in search of people who did not know about the wild sea. He went from place to place with his burden and did not stay anywhere long, until he came to a village where the people asked him what kind of a strange instrument he was carrying. There he settled. This parable can be found in various old sea stories where shipwrecked sailors tell it to their comrades to comfort them. Harrassed and disheartened sailors swear to each other that they will follow his example once they return to English soil. There is as little evidence about whether anyone ever did this as there is about the eventual fate of the traveler with the oar.

Here at least it is recognized that this "parable" points to the future and becomes impossible when narrated as a fulfillment of something.

the past and future. Achilleus' death is also prophesied. The latter's is as close as Odysseus' is far removed, the one tragic and heartrending, the other among a blessed people. One is in a foreign country, the other is at home—not in the sea, not a seaman's death. The words "apart from" do not indicate where but how he will die, not a geographical reference, not "in the land of the Thesprotians." The blessed people are not the Thesprotians, who are complete foreigners, but the freed people of Ithaka, who have their fatherly king again. (O the philologists who invent poetry!) Models do not reveal themselves only in imitations and borrowings but also in the tendency toward variation and reversal. What a change this is when compared with the *Iliad!* A "gentle," natural death, a death in harmony with the gods, is highly praised here.

A teller of fairy tales could have ended with the reunion of husband and wife, "and so they lived happily ever after." The epic poet thinks through to the end. Odysseus will have to go on another journey, as he is no Menelaos and his reward is still far distant. And yet what a reversal, how characteristic of this poet that the most prominent prophet of doom known to legend foresees such a peaceful death at the end of all the troubles he has predicted. What would be the meaning of this whole prophecy without this turn of events? What would be the point of the character of the seer? Would it be worth summoning up a Teiresias if one could not anticipate what misfortune was threatening or if there were nothing to lose and no dangers to avoid? Yet where would Odysseus be in this situation at the beginning of the reconstructed *Thesprotis?* Would he have just returned home happily? Would he have just successfully punished the Suitors? Is it not a circular argument to try to reconstruct a *Thesprotis* from this prophecy as the source for that same prophecy, whose original form would then be reconstructed in turn from the *Thesprotis?* Is there not a misunderstanding about what an origin actually is in the opinion that the source is a text, and the resulting material is also a text, and that the latter has been derived in an inadequate way from the former?

Elpenor

Elpenor is a name that speaks, a name of the kind the poet likes, and it points to hopes that have been dashed. "Elpis" is not consoling like the hope of a Christian. The youngest member of the crew, no hero, "not terribly powerful in fighting nor sound in his thoughts," he becomes the only victim of the Circe adventure that ends so well. After the farewell supper he wakes from his drunkenness and falls from the upper story of the house, breaking his neck. He did not need a journey into distant wonders to end like this. But with what consideration the insignificant man, who was no more than a companion, is chosen to mediate between the living and the dead! The reunion with him comes before those with the famous heroes.

Surely, as a result, the house of death becomes a region where, despite all the horrors, loyalty and the memory of loved ones are recalled and awakened with ever new voices. After Elpenor the mother comes as a climax. People have objected that the ghostly and vampirelike elements are so absorbed into the soul that even a mother needs to drink the blood before expressing her love. Virgil naturally would have none of this and borrowed only noble elements. But for Aeneas the Underworld is no longer an adventure. The contrast between heroic content and the fear of ghosts is equivalent to the difference between heroic and fairy-tale elements. Without this there would be no paradox in an existence that no longer exists.

Does Patroklos not also appear in the same way to Achilleus in the twenty-third book of the *Iliad,* as an unburied "comrade," who has gone ahead in death and is pleading not to be forgotten? His soul has not yet entered Hades and warns that his corpse should be burned so that he can cross over. He wants a grave as a testimony to what his life was. Although Patroklos appears in a dream, a dream is reality. The soul disappears into the earth like smoke, when the hand of a friend stretches out for it. What the soul *tells* about its wanderings by the river of the Underworld becomes part of the adventure in the *Odyssey.* There can be no doubt that as the hero and his companion are united in conversation, in amazement and revelation, plea and promise, the interconnections are too numerous to be accidental. Other elements from the same model are repeated in Odysseus' words to his dead mother (*Il.* 23.97f. ~ *Od.* 11.211f.). As Achilleus tries to take the hand of Patroklos, so Odysseus does the same with Agamemnon, but in vain. The same beginning line that introduces the appearance of Patroklos becomes the formula of introduction in the Nekyia.

And yet what a complete change! In the *Iliad* the call of the dead man is met by willingness to die in the one being called. A hero calls on another hero; the other world steps into this one with a challenge. The amazing thing for the one who is summoned is the survival of his dead friend in this weakened state, which will soon also be his. The dead man penetrates his soul as he stands at his sleeping head and the living man takes him in, just as his ashes will soon rest side by side with those of his friend. Of all epic foreshadowing this is surely the greatest. In the *Odyssey,* in which tragedy is not the most important element, its place is taken by the fulfillment of duty in this world toward a nameless comrade. Instead of heroic closeness even in death, we see here a loving sense of duty. Fame is not diminished in value by this. But it does not relieve him "whose fame reached up into the heavens" of his duty toward the man who has no part in this glory. The ideal of Odysseus for the poet of the *Odyssey* has some elements of instruction for a lord. The didactic element, which becomes the theme of the Telemachy, does appear in the adventures, even if only as an accompaniment. Elpenor represents those who are nameless.

Achilleus and Patroklos share the same spirit. Elpenor and Odysseus are opposites. However one tries to characterize the two relationships with one

UFMG - Faculdade de Letras
Biblioteca

expression, there is an element in them which defies any resolution. Wilamowitz, who has a tendency to look for local legends, surmised that this was the remembrance of a grave. But the Elpenor episode does not look like a local legend.[31]

ANTIKLEIA

The meeting with his mother, separated from the reunions that are waiting at home and advanced to Hades, is emphasized for its special significance. This meeting goes beyond anything that could have been represented in a relationship between the living. In word and gesture, in question and answer, in the epic, developed formula of three attempts and three failures, in misunderstanding and instructing, and last of all, in the way the dead woman points to the living one, who will take the place of the mother, this episode becomes a kind of separate poem. It has its own beginning, suspense, and climax as it climbs, as if in steps, from wife to son to father, until it reaches that wonderful point of stress, "for your sake," and then ends. At home there would be no room left for the mother between Eurykleia and Penelope. A whole intimacy of tone is needed on both sides, on the side of the dead as well as the living, so that her death from longing for her son does not remain a mere story. Who would have had her die in this way, if not this poet? What other significance can the twice-repeated "thrice" have here, if one compares this with its use in the battle scenes of the *Iliad* (cf. *Il.* 5.436; 16.702, 784)? The wish of the living man to satisfy himself with weeping for the dead woman, is taken word for word from the *Iliad* (*Il.* 23.97f.) but becomes a part of a new, more powerful unity quite different in tone. What a repetition of once heroic elements of style in an intimate context! And yet if one takes the Nekyia from the *Odyssey,* then one also takes away the mother. And this concerns this very poet, who portrays nothing better than reunions. Through this poet the reunion with the mother becomes a poem in itself, similar to an elegy, with the result that it could become, even more than the Elpenor episode, a model for classical German literature—for Goethe's *Euphrosyne.*

People have criticized the fact that Odysseus could question his mother so innocently, as if Teiresias had not just prophesied the upcoming battle with the Suitors to him. But that is to undervalue this as a poem. The battle with the Suitors does not belong with the whole. And the whole in turn is not connected in tone with Teiresias nor with Elpenor. But instead of a linear progression, the poet chooses here, as he often does, to interweave his threads.

[31] Mention should be made of the explanation of Marie Luise Kaschnitz in *Griechische Mythen* (Hamburg, 1947).

The Rest of the Meetings

It is part of the character of the encounters in the Nekyia that they must be comprehensive if they are to be meaningful. This completeness is already anticipated in the plan of the *Odyssey*. This turns out to be a meeting with the whole world of Greek heroes, and even beyond it, with all of humanity that has gone before. Even if they are only glimpsed, this impression is still indelible. A concept of humanity seems to take shape only in the face of death. In any case this is the first poem about humanity, not only because of the numbers mentioned but also because of their behavior and their pathos. Yet humanity and the world of heroes need contrasts and divisions to appear whole. They come and go as if arranged in a procession, men and women, heroes of Troy and heroes from earlier times. The sequence begins with the youngest who lacks deeds or fame, to end with the most powerful hero of earlier times, Heracles. Divided into two parts by a division in the middle before the main section, it twice lapses into increasingly lengthy catalogue form. Interrupting at the moment of greatest tension was probably already a technique of the rhapsodes. In the procession of heroines, we see at the same time a whole series of the fates of their sons, both glorious and wretched. Odysseus sees wonders related in legend as vividly in the world of shadows as the shadows preserve what was once alive.

As the groups follow each other, horror turns to participation, and participation into an eagerness to see, until new horror overwhelms this curiosity to see. A basic ingredient of adventure is attraction and temptation. So Odysseus here sees things from an ever more distant past until he nearly pays the penalty for his enjoyment. The paradoxical nature of the shadows, which still go their ghostly way in the empty shapes of their previous lives, as if they were still living, is revealed in fruitless attempts to embrace and is heightened in the ghostly "as-if" of the wonders from earlier times. There is Minos, with a dense crowd jostling around him, recognizable by his golden scepter, giving judgments among the dead. Here is Orion, who, with his club, is chasing the game in the meadows of asphodel, that in previous times he used to chase over the desolate mountain peaks. The third figure is Heracles surrounded by a crowd that scatters like frightened birds, as he bends his bow and aims. These three represent the whole previous age. Whether the other inserted group of three "penitents," Tityos, Tantalos, and Sisyphos, belongs to the original design in the same way is a question open to debate. But the meetings could not end with the heroes of Troy. Without the wonders of a previous age, there would be no climax toward the end.[32]

[32]This means also disagreeing about, e.g., the portions rejected by Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, pp. 199ff. He cuts out lines 566–631 as an "Orphic interpolation." So the flight from the dead follows immediately on the meeting with Ajax: "Then I would still have spoken to him, but such hordes crowded around me that I was afraid." This is not possible. In the first place the encounter with Ajax cannot have such significance that Odysseus almost does

The most significant encounters are those with which the teller of tales starts anew, those with the heroes of Troy—Agamemnon, Achilleus, and Ajax. The limitation to these three is a testimony to the art of contrast and connection. This technique alone allows tension to be created in a new poem of the same genre by the repetition of figures that have been completely finished with previously. What will the heroes of the *Iliad* say as they speak on behalf of the dead as though living and present to all?

All three have in common that they have not got over their deaths. Their pain at having had to end their lives in this way marks them more than do their gaping wounds. None of them accepts his fate as something sent from the gods the way Odysseus does. As the ghostly elements of the dead bodies disappear and at the same time become internalized in the Hades picture of epic, a strange confusion is evident in the dead men, half touching but half shocking, which makes them cling to the limitations that were imposed on them in life. Even in death none of them looks beyond himself. The dead Agamemnon feels a ghostly but deep-rooted mistrust of all women, and so each one remains confined to his experiences. Odysseus meets each one as a friend, who is surprised when he shares their experience and who was not anticipating such things. Their answers become adventures.

All three, who stand for the many, act in their contrasting and similar attitudes as symbols of a general condition, like shorthand, typical cases of violent death in general. The fate of Agamemnon contrasts not only with that of Odysseus, and Clytemnestra not only with Penelope; it also stands as most unworthy when compared with the worthiest fate. When measured by epic standards, Achilleus' death is the most glorious of all the fates of the heroes. The hero's praise with which Odysseus greets him is the more high-flown, just as his mourning was all the greater for the death of the commander of the army (11.483ff):

> No man before has been more blessed than you, nor ever
> will be. Before, when you were alive, we Argives honored you
> as we did the gods, and now in this place you have great authority
> over the dead. Do not grieve, even in death, Achilleus.

The answer is all the more unexpected (11.488–91):

> O shining Odysseus, never try to console me for dying.
> I would rather follow the plow as thrall to another
> man, one with no land allotted him and not much to live on,
> than be a king over all the perished dead.

---

not return because of it. Second, this lacks any element of temptation, although only temptation causes this danger. Not heeding his mother's warning almost costs Odysseus his life. Third, "men earlier still" in line 630 assumes that it is not only the heroes of Troy who have been mentioned in what went before. Like Wilamowitz, Schwartz, *Die Odyssee*, p. 319. For line 612 = Hesiod *Theogony* 228, cf. Focke, *Die Odyssee*, pp. 229f. Inez Sellschopp, *Stilistiche Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, Ph.D. dissertation (Hamburg, 1934), p. 52, with references to parallel passages, *Il.* 24.548 and 7.237.

People have felt that the poet who could have written this had lost touch, in a strange way, with the sense of greatness found in the heroism of the *Iliad*. And yet the answer seems all the more like Achilleus for being unexpected. What would the dead Achilleus be like if not the reverse of the living one? The futility of death, which is more evident to him than to anyone else, reverses all standards. Even among the dead he remains the one who is greatly dissatisfied, a victim of the forces that struggle against each other inside him, resisting his fate as he fulfils it. The element common to all the shadows, from the lowest to the highest level, from the thirst for sacrificial blood to the tense question about what is to come, namely the longing for life, finds its most powerful expression in him. And how he strides off across the meadow of asphodel with great strides, the same man who was just cursing his hero's lot, once he has learned of the heroic achievements of his son!

In contrast to him and apart from all the others stands the third man who cannot forgive his enemy, the destroyer of his honor, even in death, and who cannot be moved to answer even by the most heartfelt and wooing words. He is the only one who is silent and untouched by the eagerness of the others. He is Ajax who killed himself. His turning away is all the more disappointing after Odysseus' generous speech. Where in the *Iliad* was the difference between them so fully described in word and gesture? An additional aim was probably also to justify the man of many ruses, who probably appeared in a less favorable light in other poems. Scholars have criticized that as the procession of the dead proceeds further, their enjoyment of the blood is gradually forgotten. And yet how would Ajax be represented in this way, if the poet kept closely to this? Should the suicide drink the blood with the same desire for life that the others manifest? Or should he deny himself this pleasure and thus fail to recognize his enemy? Whatever expedient one could think of, the whole meeting would become impossible. And yet without Ajax there could be no Achilleus. The heroes of the *Iliad,* the centerpiece of the whole Underworld, would be omitted.

But what is it that holds everything together? There seems to be a consensus about the form of the Nekyia: it is not a journey to Hades like those of Orpheus or Heracles. It is a spirit-raising situated at the end of the inhabited world, that is to say, a calling up of the dead, yet without keeping too closely to this format. From a conjuration things gradually advance to an invasion of the dead, as the scene seems to shift imperceptibly.[33] In fact initially Odysseus is not *in* the Underworld, but at its entrance, and it is the dead who come to his sacrificial pit, rather than he mingling with the dead. But at the end he sees more and more of the scenes that are actually taking place in the Underworld. And for this reason the poet does not adhere strictly to that characteristic quality of the dead, that they must first drink of the sacrificial blood in order to become fully aware of him. As

[33] Cf. Eduard Norden, *Vergils Aeneis, Buch 6*[3] (Berlin, 1927), p. 354, on lines 236f.

things progress more and more, the crowd of faces swamps the introductory motif. But is this really a spirit-raising, as has been assumed?

At a conjuration the dead person whom one needs is forced to come up, mostly in a time of great need or danger, by magic, called by sacrifices and prayers like the soul of Agamemnon in Aeschylus' *Oresteia* or the soul of Darius in the *Persae* or the ghost of Samuel by the witch of Endor in the *First Book of Samuel*. It is always specific dead people who are called, not indiscriminate hordes. This is also true of that description of such an event in Maximus of Tyre 8.2, which seems to be closest to the Homeric one. He reports that by the lake of Avernus there is a cave where a visitor may, after sacrifice, prayer, and libation, call up any one of his friends or ancestors whom he wants. Then a shadowy image (*eidōlon*) appears, which is hard to see but is fully able to speak. It speaks with him and then goes away again. It is characteristic of the summoning of the dead that the dead person who is desired will answer when called by name, but as a rule only unwillingly, irritated at having been disturbed. The ghost usually does not feel well up here and immediately wants to go down there again, in cases when the gods of the Underworld do not order him down. "Why did you call me?" asks the ghost of Samuel, just as Darius does.[34]

Instead Odysseus has to *fend off* the hordes of ghosts swarming up. His sacrifice causes the whole Underworld to move at once. There is no need for any incantation or call and not even Teiresias is forced up; rather he is simply ahead of the general mass, thanks to his special spiritual powers, and appears as one of the first among the hordes who begin to collect. He shares his desire for sacrificial blood with the others. Moreover, the rites are not those of a conjuration. The sacrificial pit is dug for the dead collectively, the blood flows for all of them. The libation of honey, wine, and water is for all, and equally the prayer and promise of a sacrifice after his return home. Teiresias is promised a black sheep as a special offering, not as a means to attract him but as thanks for the information. Then the souls come up from "Erebos" and "gather." With prayers to the couple who rule the Underworld, the sheep, whose blood has been spilled, are skinned and burned. In long lines the ghostly army marches past, sent and recalled again by Persephone.

Their thirst for blood signifies their desire for life. Where else were dead people, who had been called up, so thirsty for life? Here they are not forced, but they crowd around; they are not resistant, rather they are eager. By drinking the blood, they sense their condition, realize that they were once alive and are able to speak again. They seek contact with the living, to have a share in the world above again, even if only in words. A dull, almost rapturous urge awakes in them, both in heroes and unknowns, in men and

[34] Other examples: the spirit-raising in Heliodorus, *Aethiopica*, 6.15; Silius Italicus, *Punica* 13.400f.; Seneca, *Oedipus* (the conjuration of the dead Laius). Aeschylus has replaced the homeric Nekyia with a regular spirit-raising in *Psychopompoi*. He also love conjurations for the impressive choruses they could give rise to.

women—only the suicide remains apart. They stretch out their hands and would like to embrace. But where else do souls that have been summoned to the world above and entranced do this? The closest analogy is not so much the oracles of the dead or their conjuration, as the well-known, great All Souls festivals, such as the Attic and Ionic ones of the Anthesteria. Then the spirits of the ancestors go about as people offer sacrifice, make libations and meals for them. Then the Underworld opens up: *mundus patet.*[35]

A release similar to these festivals of the dead seems to have been in the poet's mind as a precedent that enabled the hero to talk to so many spirits. And yet is something obvious not missing in the notion of a spirit-raising? In fact, a conjuration would seem to be what was required if the aim was simply to question Teiresias. Yet what a strange relationship between the purpose Odysseus was aiming at and the results that followed instead. How amazing that the whole world of the dead suddenly opens its gates so that that one man could be questioned! Perhaps this contradiction, and much more with it, can be explained primarily by the fact that the beliefs about the dead of that world and time, to which the great festivals of the dead belong, are so very different from the Homeric ones. The forefathers went around and were invited. They frightened, punished, and rewarded, as they were sent up by Persephone. They came not to talk about their heroic fates, but for quite different purposes! They were sent up to create new links between the Underworld and the world above, between the past and the present, as well as to cleanse and rejuvenate life above. But this age-old element, which keeps renewing itself in new forms, as can be seen in the *Demes* by the comic poet Eupolis, is anything but Homeric.

Although Virgil makes a bid to surpass his model with his descriptions of the surroundings, this model remains superior to its Roman imitation in the richness of its connections. Obviously for Aeneas the Underworld was no longer an adventure the way it was for Odysseus. But would the whole sequence of adventures not lose some meaning without the Nekyia? Only the Nekyia gives the wanderings a goal, an outward and a return journey. The meeting with the dead has the same significance for Odysseus as the Golden Fleece had for the Argonauts. The Underworld and his homeland, in their reference to each other, are the limits between which his journeyings take place. But its significance is not exhausted by this connection. The relationships are stronger than the episodes motivated by them.

SCHERIA

Odysseus' experiences among the Phaiakes present two worlds on a single stage, the world of fairy-tale wonders and the enhanced world of contemporary history. The Phaiakes find themselves settled, according to the plan of

[35] For the original meaning of ghost and mask festivals, cf. Karl Meuli, *Schweizermasken* (Zurich, 1942).

the *Odyssey,* on the boundary where the world of distant lands meets the world of home, where the narrow confines of the fairy-tale adventures expand into the wide canvas of great epic with its many characters. Consequently their existence has a splendid aspect, an element of the most contemporary spirit of the *Odyssey* amid the fairy-tale magic.

The Phaiakes have also not escaped dissection by critics. They felt it was too much for Odysseus to spend three days as the guest of Alkinoos. Rather, since he was asked his name at the first opportunity, in the evening in the hall when he was crying at the bard's song, he had to reveal his identity and tell about the adventures he had experienced. Therefore, he would be sent home the next day with a guest-present. This would spare us the curious incognito in which the hero hides himself, with the same gesture, for two days. Alkinoos' promise, which he gives right at the beginning, would be kept: "Tomorrow I will send you home." And this would deprive us of the comedy of Ares' love adventure, which [the critics thought] would be all the better.[36]

This is all very well, except that this tidying up eliminates the element that gives everything its meaning, namely the epic situation of the unknown hero as a guest: this time not the guest of Eumaios, not disguised as a beggar, rather—and now we come to what really happens between a guest and his host.

It is easy to see that a complete elimination of the second day would in turn leave its own disadvantages. A Homeric day has its own cycle of increasing tension, climax, and end. From the beginning, since the meeting with Nausikaa, this day had one goal: acceptance and entering into a guest relationship. If it were also filled up with the recognition, its preparation, and the story that follows, the day would become too full of too many different things. Although different elements can be found in one day, they must contrast and happen in two different places or some such thing. But here the goal, instead of the acceptance, would be something different, that is, the recognition. But the recognition is the aim of the second day, just as the reception is of the first. The first, as well as the second time, the goal is reached in the evening. The sun goes down as Odysseus prays to the goddess at the sanctuary of Athene where Nausikaa leaves him on the way to the city (6.321). After reaching the palace, he meets the king and the elders at a convenient moment, after they have just finished their meal and, according to their custom, are making their last libation to Hermes before going to bed (7.138). Then suddenly, by a miracle, the stranger is among

[36] "Tomorrow": 7.318 describes the new day about to start, cf. *Il.* 8.535; 9.357, 429; 18.269; *Od.* 1.272. Is it imaginable that Alkinoos would say, "I will fix your return home for the day after tomorrow?" "Why not tomorrow?" everyone would ask. Then Alkinoos would have to say in explanation, "I foresee that you will not tell us your name before then." This line is only conclusive if one assumes that it has been left over by mistake from a previous plan. But since it cannot be any different from what we have, a dissection of the poem based on this line would rely on a circular argument.

them. There is a long silence and then the plea. The one who makes the decisions among the men in the room, Queen Arete, whose knees Odysseus immediately takes hold of as he was told to, says not a word. But she is powerful! As a "suppliant," he is under her protection from now on (cf. 11.338). She would only have to speak, if he were to be torn from her, but it does not come to that. Odysseus, while being served a late supper, uses his hunger as an excuse for not saying more about himself. This is the first delay in his giving of information about himself. And now a new, solemn libation is made to Zeus, the one who assures the rights of strangers. Since the arrival of the stranger, they are all taking part in a sacred rite (cf. *Il.* 24.480ff., 570; *Od.* 14.283, etc.). The question as to where he got his clothes would be improper here and can wait until the king and queen are alone with their guest. Before going to sleep, the end of the day looks back to the beginning, with the charming, half-true story about the clothes and the daughter. That is why Arete's question about his name and origins remains unanswered. If we try to make room for the disclosure of his identity, the whole thing would be unbalanced.

And yet we are left with that contradiction, the solemn promise of a journey home on the next day, which is not kept. But let us see what happens on the next day.

Odysseus has become the guest of the king, yet the king represents the collective will of the town's aristocracy, with whom Odysseus must enter into the same relationship of obligation. The nobles are called to an assembly in the marketplace, where the newcomer is introduced to them by the king. He is granted a safe conduct, and a ship and crew are made ready. The king invites the leading nobles to receive his guest in his house. During the meal, while the singer is singing one of the famous songs of Troy, the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilleus, the king sees his guest hiding the tears he is shedding. He interrupts and invites them to watch the games.

Everyone goes to the marketplace. Nine organizers take up their duties. Nothing would prevent Odysseus from reaching home on the same day, especially as the departure was planned for the evening anyway. In the same way, Telemachos leaves for Pylos at bedtime (2.357) and from Pylos to Ithaka (15.296). During the games the guest is insulted by Euryalos. Odysseus takes up the discus and almost gives himself away by word and deed. Alkinoos allows a lively part to follow the serious one: the dance by a group to the song of Ares and Aphrodite sung by the bard, and a display of juggling skill in a ball game. The hero of the *Iliad* is amazed. Delighted, the king suggests an exchange of guest-presents. Twelve members of the ruling council are responsible for these. Each one gives a robe and a pound of gold. Euryalos, who insulted him, gives him his sword. The sun goes down and the presents are all there (8.417). Nothing is stopping Odysseus from still setting out on the same evening. The king and queen's present is added to the others last. The chest that the queen has chosen is closed. Odysseus is bathed and dressed. Then he meets Nausikaa and there is a wonderful, short

farewell between the two. Already the meal is beginning and the singer is summoned. Nothing is stopping Odysseus from leaving the same night. The presents, the meeting, the sinking sun, the whole atmosphere, everything points to the moment of farewell. Then we reach the point that was unavoidable and yet unforeseen, the point of recognition. Delayed for so long, it still reverses everything.

The recognition is so powerful, and on both sides, from the side of the questioner and the side of the person answering. So much energy that has been held back is released at once, that its waves extend as far as the last of the adventures told. Who is Odysseus? The answer to this question only comes in what he tells. The stream is held up at one point, yet at such a point where a halt is impossible and a stemming of the tide only leads to its sweeping away in a stronger current. When everyone is ready to hear about the heroism of the *Iliad* from the voices of the dead, Odysseus interrupts with a catalogue of famous women of earlier times, women, nothing but women and there is no end of them. It is night and time to sleep. He asks to be allowed to sleep, whether on the ship, which is lying ready for him, or here; it should be their and the gods' concern to escort him (11.330ff.). Even now his departure would be possible, but then the queen holds him back. He is *her* guest too, and she feels that he has not received enough presents yet. Her word carries weight and the guest is asked to be patient until morning. And Odysseus says, "By all means, for this prize." What has happened? He who was urging departure, and could hardly wait to leave, has caused himself this delay. Starting with "Yes, I am Odysseus," he ends by cheating himself of the fulfillment of his desires. Everyone feels that it is impossible for him to end with this catalogue of women. Also it is not his loss.

The points that have been stressed up to now are only relevant to one side of what is happening, only the guest/host relationship of the real world. And even on this level, there are some underlying impossibilities. How can the king introduce and commend his guest to the assembled people without saying his name or knowing who he is?

> Here is this stranger, I do not know who he is, come wandering suppliant here to my house from the eastern or western people.
>
> (8.28f.)

It never occurs to his guest to help him over his embarrassment. The king is taking something on himself here. For *this* right of guests only applies among equals. Ordinary travelers, although received with the utmost friendliness, have no part in this. It is a matter for equals to recognize one another. Receiving someone was often subject to considerations, because of the consequences it could have. On the other hand, it is a testimony to a noble nature if one does not ask too much, "Who are you?" "How did you come to this position?" In Herodotus the Lydian king Croesus does not

hesitate to complete the rite of expiation for hapless Adrastus, before asking him the necessary questions. But what is this compared with Alkinoos? His discretion borders on the fantastic. Is this still the real world? And yet people believe they can sense a psychological element here. His discretion becomes all the greater, the more his amazement grows. He has not been in doubt for a moment since the first long silence. He has even thought of a god . . . and surprisingly soon of a future son-in-law. Instead Euryalos raises the possibility of a doubt. His insinuation is, "You do not know anything about games and are one of those traders." This is equivalent to saying, "You are not a nobleman; you have slunk in among us." And yet the stranger becomes all the more mysterious to the king's friend. This question finally erupts after he has held it back for as long as possible. Surely it must be associated with a turmoil of conflicting feelings and a mixture of head-shaking, irrelevant assumptions, and expectations. What a misunderstanding in front of everyone! Such tears are not for mourning lost friends, but tears of shock created by the poet!

At any rate, this Alkinoos can be understood. But what is the solution to the puzzle in the case of Odysseus? He is silent about his reasons, according to the will of the poet, and seems just as stubborn to us as to the king's friend. What should one infer? Is it sorrow that gnaws at him or longing for his home? Does he suspect that after all he has suffered he is not himself anymore? Is he suffering from alienation? Would they believe him? Is it pride or modesty? Or is it fear that if they knew who he was, they would keep him even longer? (Perhaps it is in the same way that Telemachos, through a similar fear, avoids his guest-friend Nestor at 15.200.) Whatever it is, he does not want to say. No motive for his silence is reflected in the narrative. At home his false identity has a purpose, namely cunning and disguise. But here? People have pointed to it as the difficulties experienced by a "reworker." And yet only through the ground bass of his silence does the way lead to his melodious revelation of himself. Only the hour takes him out of himself. But the hour belongs to the poet. Odysseus's own innermost wish is for what this trick does for him, just as with his discovery by the nurse, Eurykleia. And yet how much more glorious is the victory when he does not have to face a new battle but wins through to be himself! The unmotivated part lies above the motivated part according to the layers.

For now an additional element is added to all the others. One of those two possibilities must be the case; if not one, then the other. Suppose the *Odyssey* were not an epic, and Odysseus did not appear as a hero of the *Iliad* among the people of fairy tale, a famous man among happy people, a man who has been tested in the midst of carefree people? In this way his being incognito is a symbol—an example of a life of such pleasure meets an example of such patience. A stranger, yet wondered at and revealed, he steps through the ball game, the dance, and everything. He is a guest in quite a different sense from the rules of hospitality in early Greece.

Their mutual reserve, as an epic device, supports and frames the portrait

of an idyll. Yet this time it is not a rustic scene, like Odysseus visiting Eumaios, but the picture of a town and its people. The poet of the *Odyssey* seems even more characterized than the poet of the *Iliad* by the richness of his inventive powers in dealing with similar scenes. When Odysseus, who has just been the unknown guest of the Phaiakes, returns to his house as an unknown beggar, then both these stories are hurrying on equally toward a recognition, which keeps being postponed. Here as there we have the same repetitions—twice the tears and twice the thrown footstool—the same devices for increasing tension, and in both places the same comments by the critics. For again the story seems to go somewhat further than it would seem to have originally. Why must he in both places nearly give himself away—by throwing the discus as with the washing of his feet? However, the difference is that his recognition does not become dangerous among the Phaiakes. It is the same game but with the opposite meaning. In Ithaka his removal of his mask leads, in the end, to a terrible bloodbath and judgment; here it results in revelation and in amazement at him.

Above all the scene here contains an element that this poet knows how to handle like no one else, the element of mutual discovery. Finding each other comes as confirmation of a suspicion. In this way husband and wife find each other, Telemachos and Menelaos, Odysseus and Eumaios, and also Odysseus and Alkinoos. An integral part of this process is that one shows himself a match for the other, that he loves him without knowing who he is, that he has a deeper knowledge than he is conscious of. If the journey leads from the fairy-tale king to the swineherd, if the former's kingdom creates the tension in the first story, then it is a logical part of this first story that Odysseus should *shun* Alkinoos. One does not have to be an Alkinoos to admire the famous hero. The reason why he, in his turn, does not immediately ask his guest for his name, can be found in convention. And yet what delicacy, consideration, shyness, and misgivings are added to custom here!

The *Iliad* is not like this. There people do touch each other deeply, violently, but then there is suddenly something between them that is dividing them. If one thinks this through, then one soon discovers a far-reaching difference. The constantly recurring contrast and alternation between extravagance and moderation in the *Iliad* is foreign to the whole *Odyssey*. However one chooses to formulate the play and replay of the same antithesis, this is a contrast between daemonic and human elements, between necessity in terms of oneself and becoming aware of the other person, between horror and vulnerability, harshness and gentleness. Even in the case of outwardly very similar meetings, such as Hektor and Andromache compared with Odysseus and Penelope, the same difference can be observed. The amazement felt when Odysseus suddenly kneels before Arete, is modeled on the last book of the *Iliad* as Priam kneels before Achilleus so suddenly. And yet what a different contrast exists there!

In the *Odyssey* the powers are missing both in actions and people, which sometimes rush them on beyond their plans or intentions. In this aspect

Achilleus, Patroklos, Hektor, Agamemnon, Helen, and even Paris are related. In the *Odyssey* there is not one of the characters, not even one of the suitors, who could be compared with this. Even as an avenger Odysseus does not let himself be carried away. He carries out even his most terrible deeds on instruction from Athene. Meleager suffers much more from himself and is driven much more by himself, like the young Phoinix in comparison to Theoklymenos, although the latter also has to go into exile because of a murder and becomes the follower of a foreign lord like Phoinix! In the *Iliad* an element of the extreme is par for the course, not only among the heroes but also in the events. As a result the impression made is often cruel. But cruelty only results from a basic gentleness. In turn, as we have said, the poet of the *Odyssey* writes in ever new tones about people finding each other. But part of finding the other person is also the danger of missing them, or losing them, either outwardly or inwardly. As an epic device we find that they are separated and then they almost fail to recognize each other when they meet again. We meet their doubts and their testing of each other. In addition we find the opposite: their loss of hope that they will ever find each other again, their alienation and hardening toward each other. This is the really inhuman element for the poet of the *Odyssey*. His richest tone sequences lie on this scale. This is the basic ingredient in his poetry which stays the same even when presented in the most varying forms, from the dog Argos to the game with the tokens of recognition. Is this a part of the age or of the material? Or rather is this more dependent on the poet in question?

A fruitful situation results in more than the original motif; it creates diversity and becomes a vehicle for new possibilities. In the end it allows something to be expressed in an indirect way, which if said directly would go beyond the genre. (In *Hamlet* we find something similar done in a different way). It is especially clear that the action is internalized here. It is no longer a question simply of deeds and actions but of tests, temptations, trials of the soul, and feelings such as friendship, love, loyalty, tenderness, doubt, and premonition. Odysseus' disguising of himself has as its basic reason the danger he is in. But actually this does not exhaust its meaning. Otherwise why would the game with the stranger in beggar's guise be maintained so long and drawn out until a whole world of high and low, of nobles and peasants, of right and wrong has been shown at three levels in society: lords, servants, and wanderers? The unknown avenger becomes the one who "tests," who "makes trial," a secret judge. His disguise becomes the touchstone that distinguishes true from false: true nobility in the form of a servant and false nobility in the sons of lords. What a view of the world from below! What a change in the format of ancient epic! What power this disguise has! For this reason the disguise sometimes seems thin and sometimes more convincing. Sometimes Odysseus *seems* to be a beggar only under the spell of Athene, and then he must drain to the last drop the bitterness of a man who is now old and homeless.

And, moreover, the disguise reflects the whole inner world of the love of husband and wife. Love does not show itself directly. How could he show his love without giving himself away? And a part of his disguise is also the lies that he spreads about himself. What started out as only the magic of a goddess, becomes the invention of a life story. Does he tell lies simply for revenge? Then why would he lie "like the poet," so that Eumaios listens to him as if under a spell? Why does he tell of a fate, which carries a kernel of truth in it, as a foil to his own fate, the story of a wanderer who must end in this way because he cannot give up the life of adventure? Ultimately he lies so that the born adventurer and his fate should not be missing next to that of the seer, singer, beggar, king, shepherd, etc. in the society pictured in the *Odyssey*.

With the repetition of this universal, primary form, the Phaiakes share in the real world of the poet. And yet, taking into account all these relationships, what would become of the story if it did not contradict itself? How would the story grow wings, as it were, if the real world did not alternate again and again for a moment with the world of fairy-tale wonders just as in Aladdin and his magic lamp? What were the Phaiakes once?

Of the many magic people into whose power the hero falls, giants, ogres, monsters, vampires, and the kings of fable, the latter are the only ones who help him to a good end, whose function and magic is of the opposite kind to all the others. Like elves of the distant seas, as they have been called, they bring shipwrecked sailors to their homes overnight in their magic ships as they are sleeping. From time immemorial they have been saviors, just as Asklepios the son of Apollo was once the healer of all the sick. But that was once upon a time. Just as Zeus with his lightning bolt made an end to this healing craft to ensure the god of death his tribute, so the Lord of the Seas, in order to maintain his power, ends this all-too-humane custom of safe conduct home. With his trident he heaps a mountain range over the city and people of the benefactors. This "movement of mountains," well-known as a motif, buries the ancient loveliness. As the Phaiakes come under the spell of the *Odyssey* legends, the hero from Ithaka becomes the last person whom they escort home.

The poet of this poem first separated this from the fairy-tale adventures and raised it above their level. If it were told to us as the last in a series of adventures, its fairy-tale elements would probably be preserved for us in a much purer form, and it would consequently lack "Homeric" content. Yet the more it has become a higher art form, the more the magic element is, as it were, pushed from the middle to the edges and seeks cover, hiding itself, only to appear again suddenly in a way that is all the more surprising. For the contradictions between the two distant worlds, which cause dilemmas, count in this new whole simply as one more part of its manifold magic. One may want to ask the poet hesitatingly, "Are these still the Phaiakes?" His answer would be, "Yes, they are."

Ships as swift as wings and thoughts (7.36), quicker than hawks and

falcons (13.86), which know by themselves where they should sail, must be magic ships comparable to the artificial, magic horse in the famous Indian story in *1,001 Nights*. These ships glide along so gently and lightly that a wonderful sleep comes over their guest so that when he wakes up at home, he does not know what has happened. One should not ask why the sea is never stormy when the Phaiakes are sailing. "Calmed winds" (7.319) belong to their magic, like the secret nature of their nightly journey. The "grey ones" are invisible, not men but spirits.

And yet this magic power is mentioned only from time to time, virtually only by Alkinoos, as if talking about it directly were contrary to the spirit of the epic. We hear only once that the ships are in fact alive and all-knowing, that they row themselves in a mist that makes them invisible, and that they know all the coasts and can reach any destination without needing a steersman or rudder. We learn this only in that most exciting moment, when Alkinoos can no longer restrain himself after so many tests of his patience and asks his guest his name. How the fairy-tale magic is integrated into that long-awaited moment that was always meeting new delays! The tension of this moment is directed to quite different things.

> Tell me your land, your neighborhood and your city,
> so that our ships, straining with their own purpose, can carry you
> there, for there are no steersman among the Phaiakes, neither
> are there any steering oars for them, such as other ships have,
> but the ships themselves understand men's thoughts and purposes,
> and they know all the cities of men and all their fertile
> fields, and with greatest speed they cross the gulf of the salt sea,
> huddled under a mist and cloud, nor is there ever
> any fear that they may suffer damage or come to destruction.
> Yet this I have heard once on a time from my father, Nausithoos
> who said it and told me how Poseidon would yet be angry
> with us, because we are convoy without hurt to all men.
> He said that one day, as a well-made ship of our Phaiakian
> men came back from a convoy on the misty face of the water,
> he would stun it, and pile a great mountain over our city, to hide it.
> So the old man spoke, and the god might either bring it
> to pass, or it be left undone, as the god's heart pleases.
> So now come tell me this.
>
> (8.555–72)

The kernel of the fairy tale is the excuse given as an explanation for this question that finally breaks out with such force. Direct epic narrative only touches on this subject once. And yet it makes the old miracle in turn serve a new one immediately. What was once magic for its own sake, now becomes the prize of this one man, the sufferer, inspired by nothing else but to boast of his uniqueness, and to reward his troubles.

> . . . while the ship, as in a field four stallions drawing
> a chariot all break together at the stroke of the whiplash,
> and lifting high their feet lightly beat out their path, so
> the stern of the ship would lift and the creaming wave behind her
> boiled amain in the thunderous crash of the sea. She ran on
> very steady and never wavering; even the falcon,
> that hawk that flies lightest of winged creatures, could not have paced her,
> so lightly did she run on her way and cut through the sea's waves.
> She carried a man with a mind like the gods for counsel, one whose
> spirit up to this time had endured much, suffering many
> pains: the wars of men, hard crossing of the big waters;
> but now he slept still, oblivious of all he had suffered."
>
> (13.81–92)

The poet's transcendence makes sense of and explains the contradictions. Where the poet of the *Iliad* succeeds in composing what he wishes in an always new way with the most natural necessity, the poet of the *Odyssey* succeeds, by combining one element over the other in layers, through the contradiction between the old fairy tales and the new spirit. He does this by giving the former new life and giving the latter its footing in tradition. There is a clear contradiction here in that the Phaiakes bring every shipwrecked person, whoever he is, to his home, and yet Odysseus is the only one for whom the gift of returning home is seen as such a high honor and reward. Among these hospitable people, strangers are not welcome after all, and Odysseus has to beg, almost like Priam in Achilleus' tent, for what was granted so gladly to everyone else. This points to the same phenomenon of the contradiction between fairy tale and epic. For it is only thanks to this contradiction that the higher consequence develops, which makes the Phaiakian adventure into that great turning point, giving it its place and position in epic. To create this turning point, we must have Odysseus in a position of vulnerability—the fearful moment, the pause, as Odysseus kneels before Arete, the slowly dawning premonition of the Phaiakes that this stranger is more than others, more than they themselves, the granting of his request and the delay of his journey, the repeatedly postponed discovery of who he really is.

A word should still be said about the end. Previously the ending had come with the mountains being moved. There is no need to quote references for this widespread motif. In the *Odyssey* we find instead of this story an epic scene as the angry Poseidon turns to Zeus—a scene involving the gods, modeled on the *Iliad* (*Od.* 13.145 after *Il.* 4.37, etc.). Does this not connect with the Polyphemos story? Yet here also the connection is not required for the sake of the fairy tale. If the Lord of the Seas one day puts an end to the magic of the Phaiakes, which he himself has tolerated for so long, then this does not happen because Odysseus has blinded his son but because this habit of saving people is getting out of hand. Therefore, the

explanation of the mountains covering them does not point to Odysseus either in the conversation of the gods (13.151) or in the oracle of Alkinoos (13.174). Epic can be recognized in the transcending and unifying motifs, while fairy tale is visible in the contradicting ones.

The model of the *Iliad* is hardly more evident anywhere than in that scene between the gods. And yet, if Poseidon complains to Zeus in the role he plays in the *Iliad*, as an Olympian afraid for his image, then here again the imitation of the *Iliad* has been transcribed by the poet into his own tone. What a different object for their quarrel! In the *Iliad* the gods fight over the fates of kings and peoples. Here Poseidon declares himself agreed with the success of the other gods' wishes. Let Odysseus reach home if this is what Zeus has promised him. But it is contrary to the honor of the Olympian for him to come home with such presents, so honored with richer treasures than if he had come directly from Ilium. A new element here is that the concern of the slighted god is all the greater. The less he cares about the issue itself, the more he cares about the principle. That is to say that he takes exception to what this poet first made the result of this adventure, the splendor of the reversal of fortune! He is angry because Odysseus, who was just recently so naked and unknown, is now suddenly so famous and rewarded. And Zeus knows his Poseidon well. He tells him that it is right and he should do as he plans to the Phaiakes. But if he is going to destroy the ship as it is returning home, why not rather turn it to stone so that all humans may wonder at it? Poseidon would not be Poseidon if this were not evident to him. He hits the ship with the palm of his hand and plants it as a cliff in the sea. Then he goes, or rather he is already gone! The ship turned to stone becomes an invitation on the part of the Olympian gods. Poseidon takes no part in Odysseus' sufferings at home, however much his son begged him to. He becomes angry but he does not hate. His disappearance from the scene of the action is the same as after the storm at sea. His moods change in a dignified way.

And what becomes of the Phaiakes? While people are amazed—this again is modeled after the *Iliad* (*Od.* 13.145 after *Il.* 4.37)—Alkinoos sees his father's prophecy being fulfilled and warns them to cease from escorting travelers. He has twelve steers sacrified to Poseidon. Since the otherwise usual formula "but he was not moved by the offerings" is left out, the fate of the Phaiakes remains hanging in the balance. On the one hand we have Odysseus returned home happily, on the other the Phaiakes fearfully offering sacrifices. The transition from one sphere to the other is marked by the contrast of the two situations, like sustained pauses. An epic does not end with one conclusion like a narrative but with a wide sweep of opposing scenes. The poet of the *Odyssey* seems to owe this way of leaving things hanging in the balance to the poet of the *Iliad*.

Does what has been said here exhaust the theme of adventures in the *Odyssey*? Is what is waiting for the hero at home not just as much of an adventure? A new exile is waiting for him, if not in distant lands then in the

depths of misery. He will misrepresent himself in quite a different way among people than among fiends and monsters. His transformation into a beggar—almost like an Ovidian metamorphosis—the magic, the magic wand, the hocus-pocus of Athene who does not seem like a witch—is all this not a reminiscence of Circe? One more time the fairy-tale element steps into the "realism" of great epic. This too would probably not be possible in the *Iliad*. But here also it represents and frames a transcendent theme—the theme of finding each other as a miracle. By way of a magic wand, the revenge story is linked to the adventures. Yet this leads to further questions, beyond those posed here. Here the purpose, within a limited sphere, was simply to bring the question of origins, which had gone astray, back to a negotiable path, without building castles in the air. All methods, however much they change, depend on what they yield on each occasion they are applied.